

616
THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WERE ASKED BY COLONEL HATCHER, CHIEF, INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION

- Q: , have you ever at any time had any doubts in your own mind regarding the possibility of any of these persons who had access to these files releasing that information from the files to unauthorized persons?
- A: I have never given it a thought. I have no reason to question them about handling them and put full confidence in them that they would not disclose information to an unauthorized person. I had no reason to think otherwise.
- Q: Have you ever had reason to believe that any one having access to these files had doubts regarding the possible release to unauthorized sources by any other person having access to the files?
- A: Not to my knowledge.
- Q: It may be that you have a voluntary statement that you want to make regarding the matter. Maybe you have thought of this problem let's say recently and it may be that you would like to make a voluntary statement on anything that we haven't covered.
- A: As far as I am personally concerned, I have never disclosed any information whatever that has been contained in the cases you mentioned and I have no reason to doubt anyone with whom I was working in connection with these cases. Nothing has come up that would cause me to doubt them.

Signature

Steno:SPG

About five months ago, just before Senator McCarthy's first speech, a meeting of the Red Baiters' Club was held at the home of _____ and discussed Communism in the State Department. Present at the meeting were _____

1. _____ formerly State, now ECA.
2. _____ LEB.
3. _____, State.
4. _____ House C.S. Committee.
5. _____, ECA.
6. _____ State.
7. _____, State.
8. _____, AEC.
10. _____, National Resources Security Board.
11. _____ Federal Reserve.
12. _____ Internal Revenue.

6-5-30 - Information from _____

b7c-d

June 1, 1950

MEMORANDUM

MATTERS TO BE CHECKED BY STAFF:

1. Colloquy between Senator McCarthy and Senator Jenner on the Senate floor on May 25, showing that Senator McCarthy had information as to what had transpired in the Loyalty Review Board meeting of April 5, 1950. Check to determine who was present at the April 5, 1950, meeting.

2. Check to determine whether _____ ever sat in on Board sessions.

3. Check all photostatic work ordered by or for _____ the number of copies furnished and where those copies went officially.
4. Check desk which could not be checked during prior visit.

5. Secure copy of memorandum analyzing the Service case and check whether it was prepared by _____ or, if not, who prepared. Also secure copy of the letter in the Service case which was delayed in transmission to the State Department.

6. Check with Chief Post Office Inspector on registered letter mailed _____ on Jggy, 20, 1947, to Congressman D. _____.

7. Check the analytical memorandum prepared in the case to determine who prepared it.

8. Check whether _____ secured exhibits from Coombs in the Lattimore case, whether he had them photostated. *and what happened to the copies*

9. Check whether _____ rated only six cases and what cases he actually rated.

May 29, 1950

Memorandum to Mr. Ford

Re: Loyalty Review Board Leak

(Very informal)

You had the writer arrange a conference in your office at 12 noon, Saturday, May 27th. At this conference you, Colonel James Hatcher, Chief Inspector, C.S.C., and the writer were present. At this conference you presented for review two memoranda captioned as above.

The memorandum to which attention was specifically directed refers to one an employee of the Loyalty Review Board, describes his relationship with certain Republican Congressmen or former Congressmen, refers to certain incidents with which was connected in the past, and describes some of his alleged duties with the Loyalty Review Board, his connection with Loyalty cases, his propensity to collect Communist information, statements he has allegedly made with respect to the McCarthy charges, all leading to the suspicion that was directly or indirectly been responsible for furnishing the information upon which McCarthy based his charges.

The second memorandum refers to the same individual and apparently was based upon information supplied by the same confidential source. It included, however, a reference to a colloquy between Sen. McCarthy and Sen. Jenner on the floor of the Senate on May 25, which showed that Senator McCarthy had information as to what had transpired in a Loyalty Review Board meeting on April 3, 1950 called for the purpose of determining what the President had asked for in his letter requesting a resume of particular loyalty cases. Reference in this memorandum was also made to Cyril Coombe, another employee of the Loyalty Review Board who had prepared the letter in the Service case, the contents of which was apparently known to McCarthy before it reached the State Department.

The newspaper articles reporting McCarthy's speech in Rochester on the night of May 25th were referred to during our conference. McCarthy's charges as reported in these various news articles are briefly as follows: (the fullest report appears to be that appearing in the Times-Herald, May 26th)

1. McCarthy produced copies of secret loyalty files to support his charge that Owen Lattimore had secured the reversal of an official ruling of the C.S.C. that two Chinese employees in O.W.I. were Communists and should be fired. The material was all dated in 1942 and 1943 and referred to actions taken by agencies of the C.S.C. then in existence but later superseded by the Loyalty Review Board.

2. Senator McCarthy took up the State Department's contention that Ambassador At Large Philip C. Jessup had never joined a Communist-Front organization, and produced photostats of letterheads of five Communist-Front organizations bearing the name of Jessup.

3. He referred to Sen. Chavez's speech in which he attacked Budenz and declared that Chavez's speech had been prepared "with the assistance of a Communist lawyer who succeeded in using the Senate floor as a transmission belt".

4. He also repeated a charge that Jessup accepted money for the Institute of Pacific Relations from a known Communist, Frederick V. Field.

It was proposed that an effort should be made to review materials in office at the Loyalty Review Board, and that possibly thereafter should be interviewed at his home regarding any materials he may be collecting for his personal files. It was agreed, however, that Col. Hatcher and the writer should first consult Chairman Mitchell of the C.S.C. and through him, Chairman Richardson of the Loyalty Review Board. Accordingly Mr. Mitchell was contacted at his home at 2 p.m. on Saturday afternoon May 27. Mr. Mitchell agreed to the plans proposed and made an effort to contact Mr. Richardson. Being unsuccessful, he made the statement he was sure Mr. Richardson would agree and suggested we proceed and he would consult Richardson when he was available. Before leaving Mr. Mitchell, however, it was thought advisable to request the assistance of Executive Director of C.S.C., Mr. Mayer and telephone contact was made with him and it was agreed Col. Hatcher and the writer would meet him in his office as soon as we could reach that point.

Upon reaching Mr. Moyer's office, it was agreed that someone connected with the operations of the Loyalty Review Board would have to be contacted. It was pointed out that Mr. Meloy, the Executive Secretary, was seriously ill and could not be contacted. The logical person to be contacted was thought to be a Mr. Penn who has been designated to act as Executive Secretary in Meloy's absence, it being thought by Mr. Moyer and Col. Hatcher that he is entirely trustworthy. He was finally reached about 5:30 p.m. and was asked to come to Mr. Moyer's office. In the meantime, Mr. Moyer reviewed the history of [redacted] and the incidents which occurred in 1943 and 1944 which resulted in action to transfer [redacted]

[redacted] pointing out that he was not the only one then under suspicion. He was aware of the "hobby" of [redacted] collecting all sorts of information regarding Communists which is apparently most important interest in life. He mentioned the reasons for bringing him back to Washington, and it developed that [redacted] was not supposed to have access to individual case files - he was and still is under suspicion. Since it was apparent to all, in view of the fact that he was involved as an investigator and incident, that the informant in this situation was [redacted]

Mr. Moyer also reviewed his history and some of their relations during the earlier investigation.

He was certain of the job [redacted] was appointed to less than two days before her appointment.

Moyer impressed the writer as being suspicious of [redacted] without any conclusive evidence, however, for really drastic action; and as being fond of [redacted] personally but at the same time being convinced that he does not have the ability to handle the important work he would like to have. He also considers [redacted] given to making irresponsible statements and charges.

b7CvD

Mr. Fann arrived at Mr. Moyer's office about 6:15 p.m. and arrangements were made with him to meet Mr. Moyer, Col. Hatcher and the writer at the Apex Building in which the L.R.B. is housed, at ten o'clock on Sunday morning, and he was asked to make certain that he had keys necessary to get into offices, file cabinets and desks insofar as that would be possible. He was impressed with the confidential nature of the investigation, and he offered his full cooperation on that basis. He pointed out that he had not a great deal of knowledge as yet with regard to assignments, but had discussed certain matters with Mr. Meloy. He knew, he said, who had access to the 81 cases and he knew that did not have such access. He himself had no such access and he has specifically up to this point avoided having any access to them. He impressed the writer as being a very alert individual, anxious to cooperate, and entirely frank and open in his manner. While he is quick mentally, and speaks to the point without hesitation, he seems to be careful not to reach conclusions which are not based upon facts known to him. He seems careful to label suspicions as such and apparently seeks to be absolutely fair. Mr. Moyer apparently has a high regard for his ability, discretion and trustworthiness.

Mr. Penn was not shown the memoranda referred to in the opening paragraph. However, he was asked questions based upon the memorandum. The answers to these questions are as follows:

1. never sat in on the Board sessions as the memo states he did for more than a year.

2. The personal file referred to in which is indexed names of people in government who are supposed to be Communists. This is an index of people from every where in the United States and is not confined to government.

3. He has never had photostated through the office any extracts from FBI reports or any other government documents.

4. was not, as stated, taken over all files coming before Loyalty Review Board for his own personal inspection.

5. Mr. Maloy did ask him to make a study of the Institute of Pacific Relations. His job has to do with a study of organizations and not of individual cases.

6. He did not, as stated, receive the 81 cases.

7. It is not believed to be true, as stated, that gathered for his personal files a great many exhibits and other material which has been photostated;

8. There are in office, as stated, file cabinets containing file drawers in which are index cards of alleged Communists not necessarily in government, however, but any body, any where, who was accused by any one of being a Communist. Everybody knows it is there and everybody is welcome to use it. How accurate or useful it is is another question.

9. does have, as stated, one file cabinet, file also, which has a lock and four drawers. (The contents will be discussed later.)

On Sunday morning at 10:00 A.M. the persons mentioned visited the offices of the LRS in the Apex Building. We were able to gain access to everything in office except his own desk which could not be opened without being forced. The locked file cabinet was opened first. The top drawer contained (1) correspondence regarding the exclusion of various types of positions from the Loyalty program, such as seasonal jobs, positions of short duration, etc.; (2) training manuals of the Loyalty program and other training material.

The second drawer contained material on organizations characterized by the Attorney General under the Executive Order (his primary job).

The third drawer was empty for the most part. It contained, however, blank index cards, a number of copies of bulletins issued by the Chamber of Commerce "Communists within Government," also copies of a pamphlet, "Communists within the Labor Movement," reprints of speeches by various Congressmen, a report of the Un-American Activities Committee, and a chart "Forced Labor Camps in Soviet Russia" prepared by the Editor of "Plain Talk."

The bottom drawer contained (1) Transmittal sheets of Internal organization manual of the CSC, as well as superseded pages; (2) same on Federal Personnel Manual; (3) "Communism in Action," House Document 401, half dozen copies; (5) copy of Public Law 601, 80th Cong.; (6) Chart (type 18 X 24) showing names of persons, headed by _____ and others who were connected with the Institute of Pacific Relations and their connections with other organizations. (This was apparently material he was working on in connection with his assignment from Meloy with reference to the Institute of Pacific Relations.)

Lying on top of the file cabinet just referred to were index cards on organizations in a cardboard file box.

On top of book cases was an envelope containing a pencil address "Mr. Janney, Department of Justice." In this envelope were the following photostated materials: (1) Officers and trustees of Institute of Pacific Relations, with address 1 East 54th Street, New York City; (2) Membership privileges - 21 years of IPR; (3) Officers and trustees of the American Council, IPR, 1943; (4) Officers and committee of same, 1941; (5) Same, 1938; (6) Same, 1937; (7) Same, 1936; (8) American Council, IPR, 1940; (9) Photostat of copy of letter _____ to _____ dated October 4, 1946 (4 pages) attached to which photostat of letter from _____ to _____, dated October 7, 1946. Another letter _____ to _____ dated October 16, 1946, and letter from _____ to _____ dated October 8, 1946, letter of October 17, 1946, _____ to _____ (4 pages), letter _____ to _____ of October 24, 1946. All of this had to do with a study written by _____ for the China Monthly in 1945 regarding _____ career in China, to which had taken exception.

The bookcases themselves contained nothing of interest to this investigation.

We then turned to the wooden card index file to which reference has been made heretofore. It has 105 drawers in all. Seventy-five of the drawers have some cards in them. This is an index of names of individuals taken from any source (newspapers, Tenney Commission reports, etc.). Everyone is aware of this file, which has been made up over a period of years. himself claims that most of it was made upon his own time. It has apparently been a hobby, and represents his background for his claims to being "the greatest expert on Communism" in Washington.

On top of the card index file cabinet was found: (1) A typed chart showing the members of the Board of Trustees, American Institute of Pacific Relations, 1936 to date, also Executive Committee of same; (2) Photostat of an article of Frederick V. Field which appeared in "Daily Worker;" (3) Photostat of letter to Ben Mandel from enclosing copy of report on a pro-Communist meeting held in New York "last week-end," i.e., January 23-25, 1948, an 11 page report, meeting of National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East. The report mentions persons present, including such persons as Reverend Janus Endicott, Anna Louise Strong, Fred Field, Mark Gwyn, and many others; (4) Collection of newspaper items clipped from "Times Herald."

(5) photostat copy of article from Plain Talk "The State Department Espionage Case" by Emanuel Larsen.

As stated the desk could not be opened. On its top were the following: (1) newspaper articles on McCarthy charges, (2) various Congressional Record debates, (3) newspapers on Asia, (4) a beginning draft in own handwriting of what appeared to be a history of the American Institute of Pacific Relations, attached to and to be made a part of it being list of 1946 Board and several photostats of articles from published statements from the New Leader - no photostats of government material, (5) a photostat copy of a statement re Philip C. Jessup, N. Y. Times, Jan. 4, 1949, (6) photostat copy of letter sent to members of I. P. R. thanking persons who had sent him their proxies (4/27/47), (7) to fellow members of I. P. R. - 5 pages - 3/12/47 re communist infiltration into I.P.R.

A check was made of the room of Miriam M. DeHaas because of suspicion that she is disgruntled and because of her prior connections with Congressman Judd as a missionary in China. Nothing was found however, other than materials wholly apart from matters in which she is engaged. *He was interested.*

Inquiry was then made regarding the 81 cases and we were conducted to the room in which these are filed. They are filed in two steel file cases with iron bar running from top to bottom and secured by a stout lock. They are in the custody of Mr. Cyril Coombs, who is a veteran of both the first and second World Wars and is a Reserve Officer, Naval Intelligence. Those having access to these files are Coombs, Welden, Hartsfield and Herbert Ginsburg. No effort was made to open these cabinets. It would have been impossible.

Messrs. Moyer and Hatcher and the writer then left the L.R.B. office and went to the writer's office in the Department of Justice. In as much as there was no evidence found in the office of that he was accumulating any photostats of government documents, though there were photostats of published materials, it was our view that we were not prepared at that point to take the second step of interviewing. Also much of the information given by the informant was known to be inaccurate and possibly untrue. It was the view of all of us that an effort should be made to get more specific information from the informant, particularly any information which he knew to be true as distinguished from suspicious. You were then consulted by telephone and agreed that we should next interview the informant, and confirmed our belief that the informant was. Mr. Moyer then left as it was believed that it would be best for him not to participate in any interview with. An attempt was made to reach by telephone without success. He was however reached about five o'clock and agreed to come down to the writer's office.

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXXFEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOIPA DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET

7 Page(s) withheld entirely at this location in the file. One or more of the following statements, where indicated, explain this deletion.

- ☒ Deleted under exemption(s) b7(C)(D) with no segregable material available for release to you.
- ☐ Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to you or the subject of your request.
- ☐ Information pertained only to a third party. Your name is listed in the title only.
- ☐ Document(s) originating with the following government agency(ies) _____, was/were forwarded to them for direct response to you.

Page(s) referred for consultation to the following government agency(ies); _____ as the information originated with them. You will be advised of availability upon return of the material to the FBI.

Page(s) withheld for the following reason(s):

- ☐ For your information: _____
- ☐ The following number is to be used for reference regarding these pages: _____

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 X DELETED PAGE(S) X
 X NO DUPLICATION FEE X
 X FOR THIS PAGE X
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

June 20, 1960

MEMORANDUM TO THE COMMISSION:

SUBJECT: REPORT OF INQUIRY CONCERNING ALLEGED UNAUTHORIZED
RELEASE OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.

Submitted by:

Mr. Clive Palmer,
Special Assistant to
the Attorney General

James E. Hatcher,
Chief
Investigations Division

ORIGIN OF INQUIRY:

Numerous statements appearing in the daily press and in the Congressional Record within the past few weeks have indicated that confidential information in the custody of agencies of the Executive branch of the government may be presently finding its way to unauthorized persons.

The Congressional Record of Feb. 20, 1950, shows the following statements by Senator McCarthy. Page 2046 shows in part the following:

".....For some unknown reason John Service's file has disappeared in the State Department. I have tried to find where it is, and I have been told that it is in the office, ---quoting the individual over there---of the 'top brass'."

On Page 2049 of the same date the following appears:

"I say that everything I have here is from the State Department's own files."

On Page 2055 of the same date is the following:

"I can say to the Senator that it would be extremely difficult to do that because all the records are completely secret except what I could get from loyal State Department employees....."

Page 2067 shows the following:

"The answer is that I obviously do not have photostats of all the files." And again on the same page, "Let me finish. I do not have a counter espionage group of my own. All I can do is pick up the information, check, and make sure it is confirmed by something in the State Department file. The Senator understands I do not have complete State Department files in these matters....."

Page 2068 shows the following:

"I think I have a fairly good digest of the files....."

On Page 2082, the following appears:

".....If it were not for some good, honest, loyal men in the State Department, men who were willing to risk their positions, I would not be able to give this report here tonight....."

The Congressional Record for April 25, 1950, Page 5809, shows the following statements by Senator McCarthy:

"I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana is aware of the fact that on April 3 the Loyalty Review Board met, the purpose of the meeting being to determine what the President asked for in his

letter, in which he requested a resurvey. After discussion, a motion was made, and was unanimously adopted to the effect that the Board would not consider anything having to do with bad security risks. That action was taken on April 3 by the Board. It was called together to investigate the so-called McCarthy charges."

Senator McCarthy is reported as having said further:

"First a motion was made and unanimously carried, that the Board would not under any circumstances investigate anything having to do with bad security risks."

"Second, there was rather lengthy discussion again; and again a motion was made, and unanimously carried to the effect that under no circumstances would the Board delve into any case of perversion and that despite the fact, as the Senator will recall....."

The Senator is further quoted as saying:

"Then there was additional lengthy argument as to what they were asked to do in the President's letter."

"I may say that this matter has never before been made public. I finally got the documents on this matter only this morning....."

The Congressional Record of April 27, 1950, Page 5963 shows the following as part of a statement made by Senator McCarthy pertaining to the April 3, 1950 meeting of the Loyalty Review Board:

".....There was some doubt as to whether or not they could go into the question of bad security risks and homosexuality, according to the minutes of the meeting--minutes which I am not supposed to have, of course--that they contacted the Attorney General and they contacted the President. They were instructed that this board under no circumstances should make a report or delve into the question of either bad security risk or homosexuality."

And again on the same date, the Congressional Record on Pages 5974 and 5975 shows Senator McCarthy's statement in part as follows:

.....During the entire year of 1949 Mr. Service was under intensive investigation by the FBI. Reports were forwarded to the Loyalty Review Board which reflected adversely upon his desirability as a State Department employee. On December 28, 1949, the Loyalty Review Board received a copy of such report and again on February 18, 1949, March 10, 1949, April 4, 1949, May 11, 1949, August 9, 1949, September 7, 1949, and September 21, 1949, the Loyalty Board received reports from the FBI containing information which would strongly indicate---to put it mildly---the wisdom of terminating his employment immediately. Those reports have been subsequently picked up by the Justice Department. Incidentally, three copies of each report were forwarded to the State Department. Service's file was requested by the Loyalty Review Board from the State Department repeatedly until the year 1949, but was not received by it until February 26, 1950. On March 5, 1950, as I have previously stated, the Review Board referred his file back to the State Department, with the request that further hearing be held and that a new board be appointed. On March 6, 1950, the Justice Department picked up Service's entire file."

Mr. Clive Palmer, Special Assistant to the Attorney General and James E. Ratcher of the U. S. Civil Service Commission were instructed to make appropriate inquiry.

DISCUSSION OF QUESTIONS INVOLVED

1. Minutes of the proceedings of the Loyalty Review Board for April 3, 1950 show that the Loyalty Review Board did meet on that date for the purpose of considering and acting upon a letter of instructions from higher authority. The minutes show that the Chairman and 15 members were present and that 11 members were absent. The minutes themselves do not show the attendance of staff members, but Mr. Robert J. Penn, Acting Executive Secretary of the Loyalty Review Board (in the absence due to illness of Mr. Lawrence A. Maloy) stated that to the best of his recollection and information available staff members who attended some of the board meetings were Mr. Maloy, Mr. Penn, Dr. Katherine Frederic, Jane Dove and one of the reporters, Russell Howell and Mary Fox. Mr. Penn explained that the mimeographed copies of the minutes were delivered directly to or mailed to the various members of the Loyalty Review Board and that to the best of his knowledge, a copy of the minutes went to each of the following:

Dr. Frederic, Mr. Puryear, , Mr. Penn, Mr. Maloy, Colonel Davis;

and that the following or any of them may have received copies of the minutes:

Dr. Coombs, Mr. Ginsburg, Mr. Ewin, Mr. Eiles, Miss DeHase, Mr. Hartsfield, Mr. Mancusi, Mr. Shapiro and Mr. Smith.

It will be observed that Senator McCarthy's statements as revealed by the Congressional Record of April 27 indicate that he had received detailed information concerning what transpired at the April 3 meeting of the Loyalty Review Board and also that he had received very complete information pertaining to the dates of receipt of FBI reports. This information points toward an unauthorized release from someone connected with the Loyalty Review. However, we have examined the minutes of the meeting of April 3, 1950 and we find attached to those minutes and as a part of the report, a statement designated as "Chronology - Service Case" and that chronology checks accurately with Senator McCarthy's statement down to that part of the statement which begins "On March 3, 1950, as I have previously stated, the Review Board referred the file back to the State Department." Therefore, it is obvious that if Senator McCarthy had in his possession a copy of the minutes of that date, he had in them the information which he furnished in his statement.

The attached statement of Dr. Coombs shows that he prepared a draft of such a chronology for Mr. Maloy and that Mr. Maloy made some revision. Evidently, the revised chronology was made part of the recorded minutes of the meeting.

Question: Was this apprehension expressed before or after material had been given to

Answer: It was after I had observed him checking material out of the file cabinet. He probably got other material after that time.

Question: Do you remember Mr. Coombs response to your suggestions?

Answer: I don't recall the exact response, but his response was to the effect that _____ was working under instructions from Mr. Maloy on some research matter connected with the case or cases.

Mr. Robert Penn informed us that he had knowledge of this matter and that on instructions from Mr. Maloy _____ was doing research on the background of the China situation in order to develop information for panel members who would be working on cases pertaining to persons who had connections in that part of the world. He said that he understood Mr. Maloy had authorized _____ to look at some of the files but that it was a matter between Mr. Maloy and Dr. Coombs as to who authorized release of the Lattimore file to _____

Dr. Coombs stated on Page 23 of his statement of June 7 with reference to _____ use of these files: "He had only cases relating to the _____ or Pacific Relations. A brief file on Owen Lattimore and I think he worked at the office file and some of the material that came through on Service, recent FBI stuff as it came through. He sat at my desk and looked at it and I believe that is all. I don't think he looked at the _____ file or any of the others." ".....that would have been on 2 or 3 occasions up to a week prior to his hearing which began, that would have been roughly a period of 2 weeks prior to June 1."

Dr. Coombs stated with reference to instructions from Mr. Maloy to permit to examine these files:

Answer: "He, Mr. Maloy just simply said that _____ is working on the IFE and he will have occasion to use some of your material. Previously he had indicated that no one was to have access to these files or know about them except myself, _____ and _____

Question: Did Mr. Maloy give you any instructions with reference to making any of these files available to _____ other than what you have just stated?

Answer: Not to my recollection. Mr. Maloy told me specifically that _____ was to have access to the exhibits which we had photo-stated and to the transcript of the statements and hearing before the Subcommittee. In fact _____ prepared an index of the entire 600 pages of transcript before the Tydings Subcommittee."

Mr. Maloy being ill with a heart condition will not be available for interview for at least several weeks.

Statement of June 2 shows that charge out cards of the Loyalty Review Board indicate that [redacted] checked out the State Department file in the Lattimore case on May 2, 1950 and the FBI report of investigation, the State Department file and the Civil Service Commission confidential file in the Jessup case on May 2, 1950.

2. [redacted] reported that Dr. Coombs while on active duty with the Navy for a 10-day training period subsequent to June 1, 1950, telephoned to Mr. Bartfield stating that Mrs. Maloy had said that Mr. Maloy desired certain information pertaining to the Lattimore, Jessup and other cases.

This allegation is not borne out by the statement of Mr. Bartfield when in answer to a question pertaining to this alleged conversation he said:

"No. Except in a discussion of Mr. Maloy's illness, Dr. Coombs stated that Mrs. Maloy had advised him that Mr. Maloy had apparently improved to the extent that he was wondering about what was happening in some of the cases. However, no specific cases were mentioned in that connection and my complete reaction was in relation to Mr. Maloy's apparent improvement in his illness rather than anything else.

Question: Did you at the time this statement was made have in mind any particular case that Mr. Maloy might have been interested in?

Answer: No. No particular case or cases.

Question: Are you positive, Mr. Bartfield, that in connection with this statement of Dr. Coombs he did not refer to specific cases or ask you to secure any information regarding any of them?

Answer: Yes.

Dr. Coombs' statement with reference to the alleged request for information by Mrs. Maloy shows the following colloquy:

Question: Have you any way of designating or being clearer concerning the cases involved? Would it have been [redacted] and [redacted] Could those have been the files?

Answer: That she inquired about for Mr. Maloy? The Service case might well have been one of them because it logically would have been.
--Yes --We haven't had any particular interest in that case unless there had been some newspaper item about it. I understand he has followed the newspapers.

Question: Did she ask for specific information of any sort, or only general?

Answer: Nothing specific. Just as to general developments. Anything new on them to my recollection.

4. A report of Post Office Inspector H. D. Holmes, dated June 7, 1960 shows that on January 20, 1947, at 1:00 p.m. presented a letter for registration which was given Register no. 200/1. The letter was addressed to Honorable Fred Busby, House Office Building, Washington, D. C. A twenty cent registration fee was paid, as was four cents for return receipt requested. This letter was mailed in the General Post Office, and was accepted by written up by I pouches at the General Post Office by for transmittal to the Terminal Annex Station.

It will be noted that this report of Post Office Inspector corroborates the statement of in this respect.

DISCUSSION OF SECURITY ASPECTS

In considering possible transmissions of security information which is handled by more than one agency, it becomes obvious that many persons could be the source for the transmission of any particular item of such unauthorized information. We are mindful of the fact that information pertaining to the so-called 61 cases as well as to what occurred at the meeting of the Loyalty Review Board on April 8, 1960 could have been secured through sources at more than one agency. The Congressional Record for February 20, 1960, reflects that Senator Joseph R. McCarthy stated in part: "Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the factespecially in view of the comment he recently made.....that I did not list John Service as one of the 57. Perhaps I could have, but I have listed only persons whose files were available to me. For some unknown reason John Service's file has disappeared in the State Department. I have tried to find where it is, and I have been told that it is in the office---quoting the individual over---of the 'top brass' so I have not listed Service and that is the sole reason why I have not."

It will be observed that the dates mentioned by Senator McCarthy coincide with other information indicating that the case was at that time being forwarded to the Loyalty Review Board. A mimeographed statement attached to and apparently intended as a part of the minutes of the Loyalty Review Board of April 8, 1960, shows that the file was received at the Loyalty Review Board February 24. Apparently, the file was in process of preparation for transmittal to the Loyalty Review Board at the time the Senator made this statement and it is significant that he indicates knowledge that the file had disappeared from the State Department. We, however, attempted no inquiry pertaining to any possible transmission sources at the Department of State.

We recognize that carelessness or laxity in any office or agency handling confidential material constitutes a possible source of inadvertent leakage of information to unauthorized persons. We recognize that because of the wide distribution of the minutes of the Loyalty Review Board, it is possible that, through inadvertence, a copy got into the hands of an unauthorized person and statements of Senator McCarthy as disclosed by the Congressional Record, particularly his speech of April 27, 1960 reveal that he then had in his possession the information contained in the Minutes of the meeting of April 8, 1960.

Intentional breach of security on the part of someone or more persons must be considered as an ever present possibility and in particular when considered in connection with Senator McCarthy's indication in his statement of February 20,

1950. In considering both motive and opportunity for willful breach of security, as it pertains to personnel of the Loyalty Review Board, our attention was directed to the statements of informant and to the persons named by him in connection with several transactions. We talked with Mr. Robert Penn and conducted stenographically reported interviews with Mr. Cyril Coombs and Mr. Weldon Bartfield of the Loyalty Review Board. Mr. Laurence A. Haley, Executive Secretary of the Loyalty Review Board, no doubt, can be of much help in connection with this inquiry due to his knowledge of the affairs of the office and of the characteristics of the board personnel. However, an interview with him must be postponed for some weeks due to his ill health. Both Dr. Coombs and Mr. Bartfield were mentioned by informant in his statement and both are shown to have had custody of all or part of the so-called SI cases. Dr. Coombs had custody of the cases from the time of their receipt from the State Department sometime in late March or early April until he went on 18-days active duty with the Navy, June 1, 1950. Fifty-seven of the cases, however, according to Dr. Coombs' statement were returned to the State Department by letter dated May 6, 1950. At that time Dr. Coombs stated that it was pointed out that SI of the cases were out for study by panel members and that they had previously returned 10 files for adjudication under the loyalty order. Thus making SI, SI and 10 or a total of 26 and the cases made a total of 59, rather than the so-called 81 cases. Mr. Bartfield has had custody of many of the cases in possession of the Loyalty Review Board from June 1, 1950 on through Dr. Coombs' absence on military duty.

Mr. Bartfield is a non-veteran and, therefore, has less job security than a veteran. In fact, he was laid off from his job with the Commission in a reduction in force about the year 1946 and re-employed at the time the Loyalty Review Board was set up. However, nothing has been developed to raise any doubt as to his dependability and the fact that he made some mention to Dr. Coombs of the wisdom of making the SI loyalty files available to Mr. Beale would indicate that he was concerned with the security of the files.

Dr. Coombs is a veteran employee of the Commission and is also a veteran of both world wars. He, therefore, has job security and there are no indications that he cherishes any ambition for a job other than his present classification. Nothing has been shown to indicate that he would have a motive for unauthorized transmission of confidential information to persons outside the Executive branch and Mr. Bartfield's statement as well as that of Mr. Penn indicates that there has been no question raised concerning Dr. Coombs' dependability. Informant expressed confidence in Dr. Coombs' integrity in his conversations with Mr. Palmer.

Informant has been assigned research duties in connection with loyalty matters in his position with the Loyalty Review Board. He is reported to have collected on his own initiative a large personal reference file concerning subversive matters. But we have received no indication that this collection has not been entirely legitimate and proper. He has a large card reference file of 8 x 8 cards. This is a name file and refers to sources of information in connection with the name of the person indicated. He had in his office a great deal of material including many photostats pertaining to the Institute of Pacific Relations matters, together with a 25 page analysis

concerning the background, history and personalities connected with the Institute of Pacific Relations. In addition, he had a 67 page document bearing no designation, but numbered by Pages A-1 through A-64 (numbering omitted on second page) and number B-1 through B-5. This document obviously refers to loyalty cases, but its source is not identified, nor is the date of its preparation although the material was obviously prepared in 1947 and by an investigator for some Committee. The fact that an investigator for a committee prepared this analysis is indicated on page 10 wherein the following statement is made, "The Committee investigator noted that in spite of considerable derogatory information in the file, there is a notation on the file that only a spot check is to be made in connection with the subject's application for the position of Foreign Service Career Officer....." The cases mentioned in the memorandum are numbered 1 through 106 and contain an appendix pertaining to case No. 78. The cases are not referred to by name but are designated by number only. They are identifiable as including the cases described by Senator McCarthy on February 20, 1950.

It is significant that Senator McCarthy in his speech of February 20, 1950, did not refer to anything which transpired after 1947. That fact would indicate that information contained in the attached memorandum was the basis of his speech and it appears that no effort was made prior to the date of the speech through possible contacts in the State Department, the Loyalty Review Board or elsewhere to bring down to date information with respect to the

case. It is possible that the memorandum itself was prepared by representatives of the Appropriations Subcommittee which went into these matters in the fall of 1947 and that both Senator McCarthy and received their information from a common source.

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXXFEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
FOIPA DELETED PAGE INFORMATION SHEET

1 Page(s) withheld entirely at this location in the file. One or more of the following statements, where indicated, explain this deletion.

- ☒ Deleted under exemption(s) b7(c)(D) with no segregable material available for release to you.
- ☐ Information pertained only to a third party with no reference to you or the subject of your request.
- ☐ Information pertained only to a third party. Your name is listed in the title only.
- ☐ Document(s) originating with the following government agency(ies) _____, was/were forwarded to them for direct response to you.

_____ Page(s) referred for consultation to the following government agency(ies); _____ as the information originated with them. You will be advised of availability upon return of the material to the FBI.

_____ Page(s) withheld for the following reason(s):

- ☐ For your information: _____

- ☐ The following number is to be used for reference regarding these pages:

XXXXXX
XXXXXX
XXXXXX
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
 X DELETED PAGE(S) X
 X NO DUPLICATION FEE X
 X FOR THIS PAGE X
 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

ATTACHMENTS

The following attachments are made a part of this report:

1. Report of Post Office Inspector H. D. Holmes, dated June 7, 1950,
2. Photostat of a document pertaining to analysis of cases of individuals shown by numbers as No. 1 through No. 106 on pages designated as A-1 to A-64 (page 2 not numbered) and appendix for Case No. 78 designated as pages B-1 through B-5.
3. Statement of Weldon C. Martsfield, dated June 6, 1950, comprising four pages and a signed attachment dated June 7, 1950 on one page.
4. Signed statement of Dr. Cyril L. Coombs, dated June 7, 1950, containing pages No. 1 through 24.
5. Signed statement of Dr. Cyril L. Coombs, dated June 15, 1950, containing pages No. 1 through 18.
6. Signed statement of _____, dated June 18, 1950 and comprising pages 1 through 8.

Oliver Palmer (Signature)


James E. Hatcher (Signature)

REPORT
of the



FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
WASHINGTON D. C.

To: SAC, Washington Field

August 15, 1950

There follows the report of the FBI Laboratory on the examination of evidence received from your office on August 14, 1950.

Re: UNKNOWN SUBJECT
SOURCE OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY'S
INFORMATION REGARDING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYERS
REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY
LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYERS

John Edgar Hoover, Director

YOUR FILE NO.
FBI FILE NO.
LAB. NO.

121-14939
121-23278
D-120551 AF

Examination requested by: Washington Field

Reference: Letter dated 8/11/50

Examination requested: Document

Specimens:

- Q1 A seven-page statement by Senator McCarthy.
- Q2 An eleven-page Civil Service Commission Report of Investigation.

(Originals of Q1 and Q2 previously submitted)

Results of Examination:

Specimen Q1 is a mimeograph reproduction made from mimeograph stencils which have been cut on three different typewriters as previously outlined in Laboratory Report dated August 10, 1950, in this case. The paper measures 8 1/2" by 14" and contains no watermark or other characteristic to identify its source.

RECEIVED - FBI WOOD

Specimen Q2 is a reproduction made by the photolithographic process known as "multi-lith." The paper on which this reproduction has been printed measures 8" by 10 1/2". There is nothing on any of the pages which would indicate whether it was reproduced at the government printing office or at some other printing establishment using multi-lith machines.

Because specimen Q2 is a lithograph is copy made from an original, it cannot be determined whether the Civil Service Commission date stamp on the original was made from an actual rubber stamp or was made by some other process. It is

Enclosure

SEP 15 1950
COMM - FBI

RECORDED - 127

EX-105

SEP 5 1950

Continued on 24 page

b7c

likewise not possible to determine whether the word "copy" was placed on the pages of the original with a rubber stamp or was printed. It is observed, however, that onion skin paper with the printed word "copy" such as appears on the sheets of specimen Q2 is readily obtainable.

A comparison of the typewriting on the specimens submitted and designated as Q1 and Q2 with the typewriting on the letter from Senator Joseph McCarthy which was previously submitted and designated as K1 has resulted in the conclusion that the typewriter used for pages one, four and five of Q1 and the typewriter used for Q2 is not the same typewriter which was used to typewrite K1. It has not been possible to reach a definite conclusion as to whether the typewriter used on pages one, four and five of Q1 was the same typewriter used on specimen Q2 due to the fact that specimen Q2 is a lithographic copy which obscures certain of the typewriting characteristics necessary in making a comparison.

Specimens Q1 and Q2 are returned herewith. No photographs of these copies have been made since photographs of the photostats previously submitted are retained in the Laboratory.

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : MR. A. H. BELMONT *AB*

DATE: August 15, 1950

FROM : MR. L. L. LAUGHLIN *S*

SUBJECT:

UNKNOWN SUBJECT (SOURCE OF SENATOR J. E. R.
 MCCARTHY'S INFORMATION RE EMPLOYEE, Govt. Employee
 REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY
 LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

In the absence of SAC Hottel and ASAC Fletcher, I called Supervisor [redacted] of the WFO and inquired concerning the status of this investigation.

[redacted] advised that there are a number of leads which should be given investigative attention. I asked if it would be possible to complete the investigation today and [redacted] replied that it would not; he presently has two men working full time, and will do everything within his power to bring the matter to a logical conclusion as rapidly as possible.

[redacted] pointed out that the WFO has a possibility of obtaining specimens from a typewriter in the Congressional Hotel. He stated that he understands that some of Senator McCarthy's employees, and particularly [redacted] uses this particular room in the Congressional Hotel as an office. It may be possible to obtain specimens from this typewriter on August 15 through a source available to the WFO. If they are secured they will, of course, be submitted promptly to the FBI Laboratory for comparison with the copy of the document which has been obtained by the Bureau. Through this means it may be possible to show that the document as such is fraudulent and actually was prepared by one of Senator McCarthy's employees.

[redacted] also pointed out that certain individuals who should be interviewed, such as Seth Richardson, L. V. Meloy and E. J. Fenn of the Loyalty Review Board, as well as [redacted] are not available. [redacted] who is a possible suspect, has been on sick leave since this inquiry was begun.

I told [redacted] that the Bureau desired that this investigation be completed and a report submitted to the Bureau no later than the close of business, August 15, 1950. I informed him that instructions relative to the interviewing of the above-named individuals, who are not presently available, will be issued later if such interviews were desired, but that meanwhile the report of the WFO should not be held up.

52 SEP 18 1950

RECORDED - 8
INDEXED

EX-13

SEP 5 1950

34

Tolson _____
 Ladd _____
 Nichols _____
 Belmont _____
 Clegg _____
 Glavin _____
 Harbo _____
 Rosen _____
 Tracy _____
 Harbo _____
 Mohr _____
 Tele. Room _____
 Nease _____
 Gandy _____

121-41668-25
 121-41668-112-50

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Form No. 1

THIS CASE ORIGINATED AT

WASHINGTON FIELD

FILE NO. 121-416839

OP 121

REPORT MADE AT WASHINGTON, D.C.	DATE WHEN 8/15/50	PERIOD FOR WHICH MADE 8/10-15/50	REPORT MADE BY [REDACTED] b7c
TITLE UNKNOWN SUBJECT; (Source of SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY's information regarding Government employees)			CHARACTER OF CASE REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
<p>SYNOPSIS OF FACTS:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">b7c</p> <p>[REDACTED] file at Loyalty Review Board reviewed. "Exhibit" is not replica of anything contained therein. Movement of file between State Department and Loyalty Review Board, as well as conditions under which file maintained at Loyalty Review Board set forth. Information concerning [REDACTED] employee of Loyalty Review Board, set forth together with background information regarding certain associates employed in Security Division and Office of Personnel, State Department. Results of Laboratory examination set forth.</p>			
<p>DETAILS:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>At Washington, D.C.:</u></p> <p>This is a joint investigation of the writer and Special Agent [REDACTED]</p> <p style="text-align: right;">b2</p>			
APPROVED AND FORWARDED: <i>Shuy H. Hottel</i>		SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE	
<p>COPIES OF THIS REPORT</p> <p>7 - Bureau (121-23278)</p> <p>2 - Washington Field</p>		<p>DO NOT WRITE IN THESE SPACES</p> <p>121-41683-26</p> <p>121-23278-5253</p> <p>SEP 5 1950</p> <p>34</p>	
		<p>RECORDED - 19</p> <p>INDEXED - 19</p>	

PROPERTY OF FBI - THIS CONFIDENTIAL REPORT AND ITS CONTENTS ARE LOANED TO YOU BY THE FBI AND ARE NOT TO BE DISTRIBUTED OUTSIDE OF AGENCY TO WHICH LOANED.

57
C

[REDACTED] Loyalty Review Board, was contacted on August 11, 1950. At that time [REDACTED] made available all files presently maintained by the Loyalty Review Board concerning [REDACTED]. It was noted that the McCarthy "Exhibit" was not a replica of any document contained in the [REDACTED] files, and none of the material contained therein gave any indication as to the source of Senator McCarthy's information concerning [REDACTED].

Dr. CYRIL L. COOMES, Examiner-Inspector, Loyalty Review Board, was also interviewed and he advised that in his capacity as Examiner-Inspector, he was charged with the responsibility of preparing the [REDACTED] case for post-audit by the Loyalty Review Board and the subsequent presentation of the case to a panel of the Loyalty Review Board. Dr. COOMES stated that by reason of the above, it could be stated he handled the case for the Loyalty Review Board.

Dr. COOMES stated that in discharging this responsibility he began by reviewing the FBI reports concerning [REDACTED] as well as the transcript of the Hearing afforded [REDACTED] on November 4, 1948 by the State Department Loyalty Board and the affidavits executed by [REDACTED] his wife and their character witnesses. He stated that then following the preparation of his summary the case was presented to a panel of the Loyalty Review Board on December 7, 1949. This panel consisted of the following members:

[REDACTED] Chairman

Following the consideration of the case they felt it necessary to request of the State Department that the panel members of the Loyalty Board of that agency furnish the Loyalty Review Board with the rationale of the various members upon which the original determination as to [REDACTED] was made. This request was made of the State Department by letter dated December 9, 1949, at which time all files concerning [REDACTED] were returned to the State Department.

On February 2, 1950, the State Department returned the [REDACTED] file to the Loyalty Review Board together with the rationale of the members of the State Department Loyalty Board.

An attempt was thereafter made to complete the post-audit by the same panel at the Loyalty Review Board which had originally considered the case. This was not possible prior to a meeting of the members of the Loyalty Review Board on April 3, 1950, called for the purpose of considering a request by the President that the Loyalty Review Board consider the loyalty of various individuals referred to by Senator McCarthy. Since the Loyalty Review Board voted to review

67
the cases in accordance with the President's request, [redacted] decided to disqualify himself from hearing the [redacted] case again feeling that this case should come in under consideration with all of the other cases which the Loyalty Review Board proposed to study for the President.

Accordingly, the [redacted] case was one of several which were prepared and sent out to various panels pursuant to the President's request. Since [redacted] had disqualified himself from participation in this program the [redacted] case was sent to a new panel made up of the following members:

[redacted] Chairman

Dr. COOMBS stated that because of the number of cases involved, officials of the Loyalty Review Board decided to forward the entire file in each case to the various panel chairmen, who were in turn to forward the file to other panel members following their consideration of the case.

The [redacted] file was accordingly directed to [redacted] on May 4, 1950, but recalled shortly thereafter when it was decided that the members of the TIDINGS Subcommittee would be permitted to review the files at the White House. On May 25, 1950 the file was returned to the State Department and as of this date the post-audit of the [redacted] case has not been completed by the Loyalty Review Board.

Dr. COOMBS has advised that the records of the Loyalty Review Board do not reflect the date of the original receipt of the [redacted] file by the Loyalty Review Board from the State Department. It is noted in this connection, however, that State Department records indicate that the file was originally sent to the Loyalty Review Board on December 15, 1948.

Dr. COOMBS stated it is normal procedure at the Loyalty Review Board for files to go directly to the Office of Colonel GROVER DAVIS, Chief of the Inspections Division, Loyalty Review Board, where they are maintained until such time as an Examiner-Inspector calls for the file for the purpose of preparing the case for post-audit.

Dr. COOMBS recalls that he did not call for the [redacted] file until about October, 1949 at which time he prepared a summary of the case and returned the file to the office of Colonel DAVIS, where it was maintained until December 7, 1949 when the case was originally considered by a panel of the Loyalty Review Board. During the period that Dr. COOMBS used the file for the preparation of his summary he maintained it in his desk.

As was noted previously, the [redacted] file was returned to the State Department on December 9, 1949 with a request for a rationale and was not thereafter returned to the Loyalty Review Board until February 2, 1950. Dr. COOMBS has advised that from this latter date until April 7, 1950, the file was maintained in the office of Colonel DAVIS. On this latter date Dr. COOMBS was assigned by the Loyalty Review Board to review the so-called "eighty-one cases", and he insisted that since the cases were his responsibility, he should be allowed to maintain the files relating thereto in his office.

Dr. COOMBS stated that because of the sensitive nature of the cases he attempted to establish a maximum security for the files and from April 7, 1950, until May 25, 1950, except for the period May 4, 1950 to May 24, 1950, during which time [redacted] had the file, he maintained it under lock and key.

In this connection Dr. COOMBS advised that a procedure had been agreed upon among themselves, Colonel DAVIS, L.V. MELOY, Executive Secretary, and ROBERT FEEN, Assistant Executive Secretary, as to the maintenance of the key fitting the cabinets in which the [redacted] file among others was maintained. This agreed procedure was felt necessary so that in Dr. COOMBS' absence, the files would be available to the other individuals, who were the only employees of the Loyalty Review Board who had a legitimate interest in the [redacted] file. Under this procedure it was agreed that COOMBS would keep the file cabinets locked when not in use, and that at such times when he was not in the office the key would be maintained in his "incoming work box" which was kept on the top of his desk. Dr. COOMBS was unable to state that no other employees of the Loyalty Review Board knew where the key was maintained and there is no evidence that other employees of the Loyalty Review Board were not aware of this procedure concerning the maintenance of the key.

Dr. COOMBS stated the only other individuals at the Loyalty Review Board having a legitimate interest in the [redacted] file, among others maintained in the office of Colonel DAVIS, were the three women who have served Colonel DAVIS in a clerical capacity. He identified these women as follows:

- [redacted] (reported as having served Colonel Davis until approximately February, 1950)
- [redacted] (reported to have worked for Colonel Davis during February and March, 1950)
- [redacted] (reported as having worked under Colonel Davis from March, 1950 to date).

Dr. COOMBS stated it has been his experience in handling State Department cases which come to the Loyalty Review Board for post-audit purposes, that the file, including the transcript of the Hearing and accompanying affidavits:

is transmitted to the Loyalty Review Board in one large folder and is not usually broken down into separate files, consisting of duplicate copies of pertinent correspondence or reports for the use of the various panel members of the Loyalty Review Board considering the case. He recalls that the file was received by the Loyalty Review Board in one large folder. After preparing a summary, Dr. COOMBS then reviewed the file and extracted copies of FBI reports and other pertinent material for the purpose of making up three complete files for the simultaneous consideration of the panel members interested in the case. He stated that he is certain that these files were not placed in legal size folders marked [REDACTED], respectively as was reported earlier. He pointed out that as a matter of fact the Loyalty Review Board does not use legal size folders and does not maintain this type of folders in its inventory.

This is pointed out here inasmuch as it was considered significant that the [REDACTED] file as it exists today in the State Department is broken down into separate files, as described previously, and in two of these folders the FBI reports are maintained in exactly the same order as the information concerning [REDACTED] set forth in the McCARTHY "Exhibit". It is noted, however, that in addition to the FBI reports, the Senator also made reference in his statement concerning [REDACTED] on July 25, 1950 to the letter written by Attorney [REDACTED] to ALLEN MORELAND, Legal Officer, State Department Loyalty Board. It is noted that the [REDACTED] letter appears only in that section of the State Department file concerning [REDACTED] wherein the FBI reports are not in the order as the information presented by Senator McCARTHY. It could be assumed that if Senator McCARTHY received all of the information concerning [REDACTED] at the same time, it would probably be at the time the [REDACTED] file was intact and not maintained in separate sections.

In connection with the above related information concerning the whereabouts of [REDACTED] file by date, it is to be noted that on March 20, 1950, one [REDACTED] of Senator McCARTHY's staff had in his possession a document which satisfies the description of the McCARTHY "Exhibit" and which [REDACTED] described as containing information which would be used to expose [REDACTED]. This would apparently indicate that the information was obtained from the [REDACTED] file at sometime shortly prior to that date. It will be noted that the [REDACTED] file was maintained in the office of Colonel GROVER DAVIS at the Loyalty Review Board from February 2, 1950 until April 7, 1950.

[REDACTED] an informant of unknown reliability [REDACTED] the Loyalty Review Board, has advised that he feels that [REDACTED] is furnishing information to Senator McCARTHY. The informant has also advised that he believes the McCARTHY "Exhibit" to be a forgery, for the following reasons:

b2
b7c - F
D

1. The Civil Service Commission date stamp appearing on the "Exhibit" carries the date September 10, 1948, while on page two of the "Exhibit", reference is made to the United American-Spanish Aid Committee, which is group cited by the Attorney General. The informant called attention to the fact that this group was not cited by the Attorney General until April 21, 1949 which was some seven months after this document was said to have been received in the Investigations Division of the Civil Service Commission.

2. The informant advised that the Investigations Division of the Civil Service Commission could not have received this document and stamped it inasmuch as it contains the statement of [REDACTED] which statement was not taken until a hearing was held before the State Department Loyalty Board. After action by the State Department Loyalty Board the case would have been sent to the President's Loyalty Review Board and not back to the Investigations Division of the Civil Service Commission.

3. The Civil Service Commission does not utilize the stamp "secret".

4. The heading of the "Exhibit" is set out as "United States Civil Service Commission" and under that "Investigations Position". The informant stated that this is an error inasmuch as it should be "Investigations Division". This, the informant stated, would appear to be a typographical error made while recopying from another document.

5. Distribution is not shown on official documents of the Civil Service Commission in the manner shown on the "Exhibit".

6. In preparing an official summary in the Civil Service Commission, references are made to FBI reports, but not to the names of the Special Agents writing the reports. The informant pointed out that the names of the agents are of no interest in the official summaries of these cases.

7. The Civil Service Commission does not use the "copying" paper such as was utilized in the "Exhibit". In this connection the informant advised that he has seen a copy of the "Exhibit" and noted that the watermark was of an eagle, of the type used on Senate stationery. He stated that this copy of the document to the best of his recollection was either an excellent mimeograph or was typed. He believes that this document was prepared from another paper furnished by an informant inasmuch as it is [REDACTED] understanding that a number of copies of the "Exhibit" have been circulated. He pointed out that an informant would in all probability furnish only one

copy of an official document whereas Senator McCARTHY has passed out a number of these copies all apparently bearing the stamps referred to above.

b7
D
The informant has advised that [redacted] has previously been suspected of furnishing information to certain Republican Congressmen. The informant also stated that in connection with the JOHN STEWART SERVICE case, it was to be noted that Senator McCARTHY had made statements in the Senate which referred to a decision handed down by the Loyalty Review Board, but which decision was not transmitted to the State Department for approximately six hours after Senator McCARTHY made his speech. The informant stated that this indicated to him that Senator McCARTHY's source of information was within the President's Loyalty Review Board.

The informant advised that it is his opinion, which he cannot substantiate, that Senator McCARTHY has the same type of information concerning each of the eighty one State Department cases. It is his opinion that the only person who could be furnishing the information is [redacted]. The informant pointed out that he had heard that as far back as 1944 [redacted] was mixed up in this type of activity and he has also heard that [redacted] both before and since that time, has made a practice of summarizing loyalty type cases for a file which he himself keeps and which has no apparent relation to his work with the Civil Service Commission. Informant further advised that he has also heard that [redacted] spends a great amount of his time extracting information from FBI reports, reports from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and other sources, which he places on 3" x 5" cards and which he cross references for his own personal file.

The informant further advised that he had been told in 1944 that [redacted] had in his home eight or ten file cabinets containing material and documents which he had obtained through his official position with the Civil Service Commission and that these documents and summaries were cross referenced in the card file which [redacted] maintains.

The informant pointed out that he has learned that up until a short time ago [redacted] made a practice of carrying home with him a brief case, fully packed, although his work is not said to require that he do work at his home in the evening. Informant stated that he has also learned that upon [redacted] return to work the following morning the brief case was noted to have been emptied. The informant has also learned that [redacted] on occasions, has had photostatic copies made by the Civil Service Commission of files maintained at the Loyalty Review Board, and later kept several of the copies for his own personal file.

7
C
The informant stated that he feels that [REDACTED] is fanatical on the subject of Communism and is one who feels that the government is not taking the appropriate steps to remove the Communists from the government service.

[REDACTED]

It is the informant's opinion that [REDACTED] undoubtedly has in his home a vast amount of information which he has obtained by reason of his official position and the informant feels that in all probability this material includes photostatic or actual copies of reports in the files of the Civil Service Commission.

The informant concluded by stating that he has no actual proof that BEALE is the actual leak to Senator McCARTHY, or that [REDACTED] has such material in his home. It is his opinion, however, based on a close observation of the matter, that [REDACTED] is furnishing material to Senator McCARTHY.

b2
[REDACTED] has also advised that just prior to Senator McCARTHY's first speech, earlier this year, calling attention to the question of Communism in the government, a meeting was held at the home of one [REDACTED] by a group known to him as the "Red Baiters Club" and at this meeting the question of Communism in the State Department was discussed. Those present at the meeting, according to the informant, include the following:

1. [REDACTED] (formerly employed by the State Department, now with [REDACTED])
2. [REDACTED] Loyalty Review Board
3. [REDACTED] State Department
4. [REDACTED] House Civil Service Committee
5. [REDACTED]
6. [REDACTED], State Department
7. [REDACTED], State Department
8. [REDACTED] AEC
9. [REDACTED] National Security Resources Board
10. [REDACTED] Federal Reserve
11. [REDACTED], Internal Revenue.

b7
C-10
that [REDACTED] an informant of known reliability, has advised
also maintains contact with the following individuals
although the informant could not advise as to the nature or extent of
this contact:

One [REDACTED] NLRB.
One [REDACTED]
One [REDACTED]
One [REDACTED] Department of Justice.
One [REDACTED] Agriculture.
One [REDACTED] State Department.
One [REDACTED] Veterans Administration.
One [REDACTED] Office of Secretary of Defense.
One [REDACTED] Bureau of Internal Revenue.
One [REDACTED] Government Printing Office.
One [REDACTED] American Federation of Government Employees.
One [REDACTED] I & N.
One [REDACTED] Department of Justice.
One [REDACTED] Department of Justice.
One [REDACTED]
One [REDACTED] House Committee on Un-American Activities.
One [REDACTED] House Civil Service Committee.
One [REDACTED] Social Security Administration.
One [REDACTED] Department of Justice.
One [REDACTED] NLRB.
One [REDACTED] House Committee on Un-American Activities.
One [REDACTED] United States Public Health Service.
One [REDACTED] FHA.
One [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
One [REDACTED] Department of Commerce.
One [REDACTED] Federal Security Agency.
One [REDACTED] and one TOWNE, Department of Commerce.
One [REDACTED] Veterans Administration.
One [REDACTED] Federal Reserve Board.
One [REDACTED] Department of Justice.
One [REDACTED] WAA.

It will be noted that among [redacted] associates in the so-called "Red Baiters Club", referred to previously, [redacted] of the House Civil Service Committee, [redacted] Office of Personnel, State Department, and [redacted] Bureau of Internal Revenue, were all referred to by [redacted] as contacts of [redacted] and in addition it would appear that the [redacted] referred to by [redacted] refers to [redacted] who was associated with [redacted] in the "Red Baiters Club."

It is also interesting to note that among the individuals referred to by [redacted] as associates of [redacted] in the "Red Baiters Club" the State Department files indicate that [redacted] and [redacted] are and have been employed for several years past as Special Agents with the [redacted] In the same connection [redacted] was similarly employed as a Special Agent in the [redacted] from September, 1945, until December, 1949, at which time he was transferred to the [redacted] where he is presently serving as Administrative Officer.

State Department records concerning the three abovementioned individuals reflect the following information:

Residence: [redacted]

Business Telephone: [redacted]

Residence Telephone: [redacted]

[redacted] is born on

April, 1925 -- March, 1935 -- [redacted]

March, 1935 -- March, 1943 -- [redacted]

March, 1943 -- August, 1945 -- [redacted]

WFO-121-14939

7
C
D
August, 1945 — to date, [REDACTED]

Born: [REDACTED]

Residence: [REDACTED]

Business Telephone: [REDACTED]

Residence Telephone: [REDACTED]

Of interest is the following employment of [REDACTED]
August, 1942 — September, 1945 — [REDACTED]

September, 1945, to date — [REDACTED]

In his application for employment with [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] listed [REDACTED] as a reference. [REDACTED] at
that time was employed by the Civil Service Commission as an
Investigator.

It is noted that [REDACTED] also listed as a reference one
[REDACTED] Civil Service Commission.
In this connection it is noted that [REDACTED] referred to
one [REDACTED] of ECA as a member with [REDACTED]
and [REDACTED] among others, of the "Bad Baiters Club."

[REDACTED]
Residence: [REDACTED]

Business Telephone: [REDACTED]

Residence Telephone: [REDACTED]

Born: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

April, 1943 -- May, 1944 -- [REDACTED] b7c

May, 1944 -- September, 1945 [REDACTED]

September, 1945 -- December [REDACTED]

December, 1949 -- to date [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] file [REDACTED]

also reflected [REDACTED]

A mimeographed copy of the seven page statement of Senator MC CARTHY, distributed on July 25, 1950, and a "multi-lith" copy of the "exhibit" (the eleven page so-called Civil Service Commission Report of Investigation), distributed with the statement, were examined by the Federal Bureau of Investigation Laboratory, where the following information was determined:

It was concluded that three typewriters were used in writing the seven page statement. The top line of page one was written with a typewriter equipped with Remington Noiseless Elite Type. Page two of the statement was written with a typewriter equipped with Remington Noiseless Elite Type. Pages three, six, and seven were written with a typewriter equipped with Remington Noiseless Elite Type, which is different from the typewriter used to write page two. The balance of page one and pages four and five were written on a machine equipped with Royal Large Elite Type.

The paper on which the mimeographed reproduction was made measures $8\frac{1}{2}$ " x 14" and contains no watermark or other characteristic to identify its source.

The "exhibit" referred to above is a reproduction made by the photolithographic process known as "multi-lith". The paper on which this reproduction has been printed measures 8" x 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " and contains the Government watermark. There is nothing on any of the pages which would indicate whether it was reproduced at the Government Printing Office or at some other printing establishment using multi-lith machines. Because the "exhibit" is a lithographic copy made from an original, it cannot be determined whether the Civil Service Commission date stamp on the original was made from an actual rubber stamp or was made by some other process. It is likewise not possible to determine whether the word "copy" was placed on the pages of the original with a rubber stamp or was printed. It is observed, however, that onionskin paper with the printed word "copy", such as appears on the sheets of the "exhibit", is readily obtainable.

A comparison of the typewriting on the seven page statement by Senator MC CARTHY and the "exhibit" with the typewriting on the letter from Senator JOSEPH MC CARTHY, dated June 27, 1950, has resulted in the conclusion that the typewriter used for pages one, four and five of the seven page statement by Senator MC CARTHY and the typewriter used for the "exhibit" is not the same typewriter which was used to typewrite the letter from Senator MC CARTHY dated June 27, 1950. It has not been possible to reach a definite conclusion as to whether the typewriter used on pages one, four and five of the seven page statement of Senator MC CARTHY was the same typewriter used on the "exhibit" due to the fact that the "exhibit" is a lithographic copy which obscures certain of the typewriting characteristics necessary in making a comparison.

Also submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation Laboratory were impressions of the three rubber date stamps presently in use by the Civil Service Commission Investigations Division. A comparison of the rubber stamp impression on the first page of the eleven page "exhibit" with the known rubber stamp impressions submitted has resulted in the conclusion that the impression on the eleven page "exhibit" was not made from any of the rubber stamps used to make the impressions as submitted, which stamps are presently in use by the Civil Service Commission Investigations Division.

ADMINISTRATIVE

This closing report is being submitted in accordance with Bureau instructions received on August 14, 1950. Accordingly the leads set out for the Washington Field Office in referenced report are not being covered.

All leads specifically set forth in Bureau letter instituting investigation in this case have been covered in referenced report and in this report with the exception of interviews with SETH RICHARDSON and L. V. MELOY of the Loyalty Review Board, with DONALD NICHOLSON of the Department of State (except for a specific inquiry handled by the Miami Office), and with Colonel JAMES E. HATCHER of the Investigations Division, Civil Service Commission. These individuals were not available for interview, being on vacation out of the city or in the case of Mr. MELOY because of illness.

[redacted] of the Loyalty Review Board is presently on sick leave, [redacted] b7c

By letter dated August 11, 1950, evidence was forwarded to the FBI Laboratory for examination. The results of that examination are not included herein since they have not been received. It is assumed that the Bureau will insert the results of the examination by the FBI Laboratory and they will not be reported by this office. The evidence will be returned to the contributor upon receipt by this office.

It was ascertained through an interview with C. L. COOMBS, referred to in the details, [redacted] daughter of Mr. [redacted] of the Loyalty Review Board, is a Guide at the United States Capitol. She is reported to have told her father and [redacted] that she was present in the Senate on July 25, 1950, when Senator MC CARTHY was presenting his address in instant matter. [redacted] reportedly stated that she had understood Senator MC CARTHY to have referred to his having had certain of the information received from [redacted] b7c D

ADMINISTRATIVE

his sources read to him by a source over the telephone. The Congressional Record does not reflect this interpretation. An interview with [REDACTED] has not been conducted. It is [REDACTED] who obtained the "originals" of the material passed around by Senator MC CARTHY on the Senate floor which were secured by this office and submitted to the FBI Laboratory for examination by letter dated August 11, 1950. b7c

There are being submitted separately for the completion of the Bureau's file photostatic copies of material loaned to this office by Mr. CLIVE W. PALMER, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, as reflected in Washington Field Office teletype dated August 10, 1950. Mr. PALMER indicated that free use might be made of the information appearing in his report dated June 20, 1950, but that his confidential memorandum to PEYTON FORD was loaned merely for information and possible leads, and was not to be referred to in the investigation since it was a personal memorandum from him to PEYTON FORD for the latter's information, and reflected his personal opinions not based on definite evidence. The original material is being returned to Mr. PALMER.

Information has been received during this investigation that former Special Agent [REDACTED] who has been attached to Senator MC CARTHY's staff, left that employment about four weeks ago and is presently employed by the State of Maryland. He is located at [REDACTED] Annapolis, Maryland. It was also learned that [REDACTED] formerly attached to Senator MC CARTHY's staff, has severed this connection and has resumed his practice of law at Milwaukee, Wisconsin. b7c

An Agent of this office recently had occasion to interview [REDACTED] in connection with an investigation. Upon making an appointment to see [REDACTED] the latter requested the agent to meet him in Room [REDACTED] Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C.

b7c

C1

1

The Bureau is advised that [REDACTED]

WFO-121-14939

INFORMANT

b7c

[REDACTED]

REFERENCE: Report of Special Agent [REDACTED], dated August 10, 1950.

The Attorney General

August 16, 1950

Director, FBI

121-41668-27
UNKNOWN SUBJECT

(SOURCE OF SENATOR JOSEPH E. McCARTHY'S
INFORMATION REGARDING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES)
REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY
LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

28-GEORGE
121-23278-223

Reference is made to Mr. Peyton Ford's memorandum dated August 3, 1950, concerning the above-captioned matter, wherein Mr. Ford advised that he had discussed this matter with you and that you believed a complete investigation should be undertaken at once.

Transmitted at this time is one copy each of the following reports:

Report of Special Agent [REDACTED]

dated August 10, 1950, at Washington, D. C.

APPROPRIATE AGENCIES
AND FIELD OFFICES

ADVISED BY ROUTING

SLIP (S) OF *discovery*
DATE 5-16-77

Report of Special Agent [REDACTED]

dated August 15, 1950, at Washington, D. C.

It will be noted that Mr. Seth F. Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board, Colonel James E. Hatcher, Chief, Investigations Division, Civil Service Commission, Donald L. Nicholson, Chief, Security Division, State Department, L. V. Meloy, Executive Secretary, Loyalty Review Board, and Robert Penn of the Loyalty Review Board were not interviewed during the above investigation, since it was determined that they are presently away from Washington or were at home recovering from illness.

It will also be noted that the Bureau has not interviewed [REDACTED] of the Loyalty Review Board since it was learned that he is presently on sick leave [REDACTED]

Concerning [REDACTED] there was transmitted herewith one copy each of the following reports reflecting the results of a "Special Inquiry" conducted by the Bureau in 1945, at which time [REDACTED] was being considered for a position with the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

Attachments

59 FEB 26 1951

RECEIVED O.
THE PH
OCT 16-50

DECLASSIFIED
ON 5-16-77
3832
10/10/50

Report of Special Agent [redacted]
dated March 21, 1945, at Washington, D. C.

Report of Special Agent [redacted]
dated March 24, 1945, at Louisville, Kentucky

Report of Special Agent [redacted]
dated March 20, 1945, at Chicago, Illinois

Report of Special Agent [redacted]
dated March 23, 1945, at Indianapolis, Indiana

On August 4, 1950, a Bureau official interviewed Senator Joseph McCarthy, at which time Senator McCarthy stated he could not furnish any information concerning this matter; that his course was confidential and he could not disclose it. He further stated that no employee of his could furnish any information relative to this matter and that he had instructed them not to disclose the source of any of his material.

As you are aware an inquiry was made by Elton Palmer of the Department regarding the possibility of information being divulged by someone at the Loyalty Review Board. It is my understanding that the results of this inquiry are already contained in the Department's files.

No further investigation is contemplated by the Bureau in this matter.

Mr. Tolson _____
Mr. E. A. Tamm _____
Mr. Clegg _____
Mr. Glavin _____
Mr. Ladd _____
Mr. Nichols _____
Mr. Rosen _____
Mr. Tracy _____
Mr. Carson _____
Mr. Egan _____
Mr. Gurnea _____
Mr. Harbo _____
Mr. Hendon _____
Mr. Jones _____
Mr. Mumford _____
Mr. Quinn Tamm _____
Mr. Nease _____
Miss Gandy _____

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : THE DIRECTOR

DATE: August 16, 1950

FROM : MR. D. M. LADD

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT

(SOURCE OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S INFORMATION
REGARDING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES)
REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY
LGE

Tolson
Ladd
Nichols
Belmont
Clegg
Glavin
Harbo
Rosen
Tracy
Mohr
Tele. Room
Holloman
Gandy

PURPOSE:

To advise you of the results of our investigation in an effort to determine the source of Senator McCarthy's information concerning the case of [REDACTED] and to suggest that reports reflecting the results of this investigation be furnished to the Attorney General and no further action be taken by the Bureau.

BACKGROUND:

Senator McCarthy, on July 25, 1950, made a statement on the floor of the Senate concerning a "Mr. X" in the State Department, who was subsequently identified as [REDACTED] subject of a full field loyalty investigation by the Bureau.

b7c

In making his statement, Senator McCarthy distributed copies of a document, hereafter referred to as the "exhibit" which purported to be a Civil Service Commission summary of the investigation of Posniak. On July 25, 1950, the Attorney General asked us to conduct an investigation to determine the source from which Senator McCarthy obtained this "exhibit," indicating in his request that there may have been a violation of Title 18, Section 641 and 2071, USCA, dealing with the theft, embezzlement and unlawful removal of Government documents. We asked the Attorney General whether he desired us to interview Senator McCarthy or whether he desired to call him before a Federal Grand Jury. In response, Peyton Ford by memorandum of August 3, 1950, advised he had discussed the matter with the Attorney General and believed a complete investigation should be undertaken. He suggested that all interviews and other inquiries believed to be logical and necessary should be undertaken immediately.

Accordingly, I interviewed Senator McCarthy on August 4, 1950, as to the source of the "exhibit" which accompanied his press release regarding [REDACTED]. Senator McCarthy refused to disclose his source and further stated that no employees in his office could furnish any information regarding this matter; that he had instructed them not to disclose the source of any of his material since he felt it his duty to protect his source.

RECORDED - 82
INDEXED - 82

Proceeding from there, we conducted an investigation at the Civil Service Commission, the State Department, and the Loyalty Review

Attachment

EX-13

b7c

Board. During the initial inquiries into this matter it was determined that Clive Palmer of the Department had conducted an extensive inquiry concerning a so-called "leak" in the Loyalty Review Board. You may recall that Seth Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board, on March 14, 1950, wanted the Bureau to conduct an investigation concerning this "leak" and we advised him at that time that the matter was strictly an administrative one and did not constitute a violation the Bureau could investigate. Our investigation at the CSC, the State Department, and the Loyalty Review Board, and the examination of the material gathered by Clive Palmer has revealed the following significant points:

(1) Senator McCarthy's "exhibit" is apparently not an authentic copy of any document prepared by the CSC, the State Department or the Loyalty Review Board, according to representatives of these three agencies. No documents similar to the "McCarthy exhibit" could be located in the files of these three agencies. The "exhibit" bears what purports to be a date stamp of the Investigations Division, Civil Service Commission. No date stamps of the CSC were found during the investigation similar to the one appearing on McCarthy's "exhibit." It was noted also that the "exhibit" on page two characterizes the United American Spanish Aid Committee as having been cited by the Attorney General. The "exhibit" is dated September 10, 1948, whereas the United American Spanish Aid Committee was not cited by the Attorney General until April 21, 1949.

b7C
(2) The "exhibit" contains a signed statement of [redacted] dated September 7, 1948, which did not appear in the Bureau's loyalty reports and which we have ascertained was taken by the State Department Loyalty Board in connection with the adjudication of [redacted] cases. The CSC has never had a copy of this particular statement in its files, indicating that Senator McCarthy's source is apparently not within the CSC itself. The [redacted] file, as presently maintained by the State Department, is made up in four folders. Two of these folders actually contain the statement of [redacted] and it was particularly interesting to note that one of them had the Bureau's reports and the [redacted] statement arranged in the same sequence as they appeared in Senator McCarthy's "exhibit." These four folders have been traveling back and forth between the State Department and the Loyalty Review Board but it is interesting to note that from February 2, 1950, to May 25, 1950, they were in the possession of the Loyalty Review Board. Senator McCarthy originally began his charges against the State Department on February 20, 1950. From February 2, 1950,

b7C
until April 7, 1950, the file was maintained in the office of Colonel Grover Davis, Chief of the Inspections Division, Loyalty Review Board, where all loyalty files are maintained until such time as an Examiner-Inspector calls for the file to prepare the case for the Loyalty Review Board. The file was called by Dr. Cyril L. Coombe, Examiner-Inspector, Loyalty Review Board, on April 7, 1950, and maintained in his custody in a locked file cabinet from April 7, 1950, until May 25, 1950, except for the period May 4, 1950, to May 24, 1950, during which time the file had been transmitted to [redacted] at Oxford, Ohio. [redacted] was Chairman of the panel considering the case. However, while the file was in Dr. Coombe's office, the key to the file cabinet was kept in his "incoming work box" on the top of his desk and this fact could apparently have been known to other employees of the Loyalty Review Board not immediately concerned with the case and such employees could thereby have gained access to the file.

(3) You will recall that on March 23, 1950, the Baltimore Office advised us that [redacted] had advised SA [redacted] of the Baltimore Office on March 20, 1950, that Senator McCarthy was going to expose [redacted] a State Department employee. At the time [redacted] had in his possession a memorandum apparently from Senator McCarthy's office which included quoted material apparently from Bureau investigative reports. Agent [redacted] concluded this material came from our reports because he recognized the names of Special Agents Joseph Kelly and Richard Clancy. Agent [redacted] only had a glimpse of this memorandum in [redacted] possession and, of course, did not make any direct inquiries of [redacted] concerning it. No record could be located at the time of a case on [redacted] but we discovered that in the loyalty investigation of [redacted] reports had been submitted by SA Joseph M. Kelly and SA Richard T. Clancy. The possibility, therefore, exists that the "exhibit" which Senator McCarthy used on July 25, 1950, is the same document which [redacted] had in his possession on March 20, 1950. We, of course, have taken no steps toward interviewing [redacted] because, as previously noted, when I interviewed Senator McCarthy on August 4, 1950, he stated that no employee in his office could furnish any information concerning this matter since he had instructed them all not to disclose the source of any of his material.

b7C
(4) Based on information provided on a highly confidential basis by [redacted] a possible suspect in this case is [redacted]

b7
C-D

██████████ Loyalty Review Board. ██████████ has stated that the CSC in 1944 established for all practical purposes that ██████████ had been furnishing information to Congressmen Wigglesworth, Busbey, Reese and Bursell. According to ██████████ spends a great deal of time extracting information from FBI reports, reports from the HCUA, and other sources which he places on 3x5 cards. ██████████ had also heard in 1944 that ██████████ maintained eight or ten file cabinets containing material and documents obtained through his official position at the CSC. ██████████ advised that in connection with the ~~Wainwright~~ Stewart Serv. case, Senator McCarthy had made statements before the Senate referring to a decision handed down by the Loyalty Review Board approximately six hours before the Loyalty Review Board actually transmitted the decision to the State Department. ██████████ advised that ██████████ was extremely nervous and excited on the day this incident occurred. When Clive Palmer of the Department of Justice attempted to make an investigation of the "leak" at the Loyalty Review Board, ██████████ furnished information concerning ██████████ to Palmer. Palmer questioned several individuals at the Board and was apparently going to question ██████████ but ██████████ had departed for home late in the afternoon when Palmer finished talking to other employees, and the following day ██████████ was ██████████. According to ██████████ is fanatical on the subject of Communism and feels that the Government is not taking appropriate steps to remove Communists from the Government. ██████████ has still not returned to work at the Loyalty Review Board and we have made no effort to interview him because of his physical condition.

Information in Bureau Files Regarding ██████████

██████████ was the subject of a special inquiry type investigation for the position of investigator, House Committee on Un-American, ██████████. During the inquiry it was determined that ██████████

b7
C
b6

b7
C
b6

[REDACTED]

During the course of our investigation we have not interviewed the Honorable Seth W. Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board; L. V. Meloy, Executive Secretary; or Mr. James E. Hatcher, Chief, Investigations Division, CSC. It was ascertained that Richardson is "camping out" in the pine woods out of touch of civilization. Meloy is suffering from a heart attack and his condition will not permit an interview with him. Hatcher is on leave in Canada. However, it is doubtful whether these men would be able to provide any information without reference to their files and we have examined the appropriate files at the CSC and the Loyalty Review Board and have discussed the matter with officials presently on duty at these agencies.

RECOMMENDATION:

Attached for your approval is a memorandum to the Attorney General transmitting reports reflecting the results of our investigation and copies of reports reflecting the results of the special inquiry type investigation conducted concerning [REDACTED]. The Attorney General is being advised that no further action is contemplated by the Bureau in this matter.

b7c

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Room 5744 10711, 1950

*

TO: ☒ Director
☐ Mr. Ladd
☐ Mr. Clegg
☐ Mr. Glavin
☐ Mr. Harbo
☐ Mr. Nichols
☐ Mr. Rosen
☐ Mr. Tracy
☐ Mr. Belmont
☐ Mr. Mohr
☐ Mr. Mohr
☐ Mr. Carlson
☐ Mr. Callahan
☐ Mr. Nease
☐ Miss Gandy
☐ Personnel Files Section
☐ Records Section
☐ Mrs. Skillman

Mr. Tolson _____
 Mr. Ladd _____
 Mr. Clegg _____
 Mr. Glavin _____
 Mr. Nichols _____
 Mr. Rosen _____
 Mr. Tracy _____
 Mr. Harbo _____
 Mr. Belmont _____
 Mr. Mohr _____
 Tele. Room _____
 Mr. Nease _____
 Miss Gandy _____

See Me For Appropriate Action

Send File Note and Return

Clyde Tolson

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Director, FBI
 FROM : GUY HOTTEL, SAC, Washington Field

DATE: September 18, 1950

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT;
 Source of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY's
 Information Regarding Government Employees
 REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY
 LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
 (Bufile 121-23278)

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
 HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

DATE 11/16/80 BY SP-5 RJK/klh

b7c [redacted] who is now employed as an investigator by U. S. Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, made the following statement to Special Agent [redacted] of this office, when contacted on September 15, 1950, on official business.

[redacted] said "I would like to get a copy of the Bureau's summary report on LATTIMORE". He presumed that approximately twelve Bureau offices had these reports, and that copies had also been distributed to ONI and G-2, Department of the Army. [redacted] indicated that in the past, he had been able to secure some information from the New York Office of ONI. He stated that he needed such a report inasmuch as Senator McCARTHY, in the future, would not make any further allegations without being able to support such allegations by an investigative report. He said that if he could get the report, he could attribute the information contained therein to another government investigative agency, explaining that "this is what happened in the Case".

[redacted] advised that he was aware that the Bureau had initiated an investigation to determine how Senator McCARTHY could have obtained the information appearing in the CSC investigative file concerning [redacted]. He also stated that the Senator had been questioned in this regard by Assistant to the Director D. M. LADD.

[redacted] said that if he had the LATTIMORE summary report, it would be handled in the same fashion as was done in the [redacted] Case, explaining that he would insert the information appearing in the Bureau report in the form of a summary of information appearing in the CSC investigative files, thus making it appear that his office had secured a CSC file rather than a Bureau file. In this way, [redacted] said he would not be violating any laws inasmuch as the CSC summary report would not be a bona fide report of a government agency.

b7c
 121-14939
 cc - Bufile 100-24628
 cc - Baltimore (100-14630)
 cc - New York (100-94061)
 cc - WFO File 100-20548

RECORDED - 47

INDEXED - 47

FEB 18 1951

EX-127

61 MAR 2 1951

b7c

PER-ELITE SERVICES
 AND FIELD OFFICES
 ADVISED BY ROUTING
 SLIP (S) 10/16/50
 DATE 10/16/50 BY [redacted]

UNRECORDED COPY FILED IN 100-24128-1

and thus a theft of government property case, as such could not be proved. He also believed that a theft of government property with respect to the information contained in the report could not be proved inasmuch as the information would be completely paraphrased, making it impossible for any observer to determine that the information was actually taken from a Bureau report.

[REDACTED] b7C
[REDACTED] did not specifically ask Agent [REDACTED] to secure a copy of this report, nor did he in any way intimate that he could obtain this report from his Bureau acquaintances. He likewise did not indicate that Senator McCARTHY was aware of the practice evidently adopted by him in the [REDACTED] Case or in making such an informal request for a Bureau report.

[REDACTED]

The foregoing data was volunteered in its entirety by [REDACTED] who made these statements without the solicitation of Agent [REDACTED] whose only comment at the conclusion of [REDACTED] remark was that this report would not be available to him.

[REDACTED] has been in contact with this office during the investigation of the LATTIMORE Case. He has furnished this office with general correspondence received by Senator McCARTHY which contained certain allegations bearing on the internal security of the country, which allegations were within the Bureau's investigative jurisdiction.

Contact with [REDACTED] will be continued on a strictly formal and official basis, and this office will continue to receive such correspondence as [REDACTED] voluntarily makes available, unless otherwise advised by the Bureau.

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation

DATE: September 19, 1950

FROM : Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General

FF:JMJ:J

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT

51-16-91

(SOURCE OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. McCARTHY'S
INFORMATION REGARDING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES)
REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY
LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

CONFIDENTIAL

This refers to your memorandum to The Attorney General of
August 16, 1950.

Please interview Mr. Seth W. Richardson and the other persons
mentioned in your memorandum, including [REDACTED] at times
deemed propitious and develop all logical leads. The purpose is to
determine whether [REDACTED] or anyone else, has violated Section 2071
or Section 641, Title 18 U.S.C. (1948 ed.), in supplying information
to Senator McCarthy or otherwise.

RECORDED - 47
INDEXED - 47

SEP 25 1950

1. 11. 25. 57
HFC EX-27

Endorsed by *One L. P. [REDACTED]*
Special Assistant to the
Attorney General

571

1001

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation

DATE: September 28, 1950

FROM : Dayton Ford, Deputy Attorney General

JMM:GND:aw

SUBJECT: Unknown Subject

51-16-91

(Source of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's
Information Regarding Government Employees);
Removal of Government Property;
Loyalty of Government Employees.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

This refers to our memorandum of September 19, 1950, relating to the case mentioned above.

We have been informed that [REDACTED] **b7c**
now a Civil Service investigator, may have some helpful
information regarding the matter under investigation. In
addition to the interviews suggested in our previous memorandum,
it is desired that you arrange to have [REDACTED] interviewed.

Exempted by Eric L. P. [REDACTED]
Special Assistant to the
Attorney General

REC-11
EX-11

121-41168-30

121

26573

RECORDED - 47

OCT 11 1950

INDEXED - 47

121

b7c

59 FEB 26 1951

SAC, Washington Field Office

September 29, 1950

Director, FBI

BY SPECIAL MESSENGER

UNKNOWN SUBJECT;
Source of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY's
Information Regarding Government Employees)
REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY
LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Re: SA [REDACTED] Washington, 8-10-50 and 8-15-50. b7c

Refers and reports covering SI on [REDACTED] in 1945 when
being considered for position with [REDACTED]
transmitted to AG 8-16-50.

During SI re [REDACTED] it was determined that [REDACTED] had been a

Memo of 8-16-50, to AG stated Seth W. Richardson, James E. Hatcher,
Donald L. Nicholson, L. V. Meloy and Robert Fenn were not interviewed during
captioned investigation since it was determined they were absent from Wash-
ington or ill. Also stated [REDACTED] not being interviewed since he was on sick
leave. [REDACTED] Memo further advised AG that
Senator McCarthy had stated he could not furnish any information concerning
this matter; that his source was confidential and he could not disclose it;
and further that no employee of his would furnish any information relative
to this matter and that AG had instructed them not to disclose the source
of any of his material.

By memo 9-19-50, Deputy Attorney General Peyton Ford made following
request:

"Please interview Mr. Seth W. Richardson and the other persons
mentioned in your memorandum, including [REDACTED] at times

121-23278

RECEIVED - DIRECTOR

RECORDED - 47

EX-121

121-41668-31

121-23278-2634

b7c

b7c

deemed propitious and develop all logical leads. The purpose is to determine whether [redacted] or anyone else, has violated Section 2071 or Section 641, Title 18 U.S.C. (1948 ed.), in supplying information to Senator McCarthy or otherwise."

Handle immediately. Utmost tact and circumspection necessary.

October 5, 1950

SAC, Washington Field

Director, FBI

BY SPECIAL MESSENGER

UNKNOWN SUBJECT

(Source of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's
Information Regarding Government Employees);
Removal of Government Property;
Loyalty of Government Employees

b7c

Rebulet 9/29/50 instructing that Mr. Seth W. Richardson and
[redacted] be interviewed per Mr. Peyton Ford's instructions. Bureau now in receipt
of information from Mr. Ford instructing that Bureau interview [redacted]
Civil Service investigator, who may have some helpful information regarding
instant investigation. RM:le.

b7c

COMMUNICATIONS SECTION
FBI
RECEIVED

2 2 8 PM '50

RECORDED

MAILED 17
OCT 5 1950
COMM-FBI

FEB 18 1951

b7c

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Mohr _____
Tele. Room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

59 FEB 26 1951

The Director

October 5, 1950

D. M. Ladd

PURPOSE

(1) To advise you that when [redacted] told us if we gave him a copy of the summary report on Lattimore, it would be handled in the same manner as was done in the [redacted] case, he was undoubtedly unthinkingly referring to the document distributed by Senator McCarthy on July 25, 1950, which purported to be a Civil Service Commission summary of the investigation of [redacted]

(2) To suggest we do not interview [redacted] concerning the above.

(3) To advise you that [redacted] called the Bureau on October 2, 1950, not August 2, 1950.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

You will recall on September 15, 1950, [redacted] advised an Agent of the Washington Field Office he would like to get a copy of the Bureau's summary report on Lattimore, and in this regard, [redacted] volunteered if he had the Lattimore summary report, it would be handled in the same fashion as was done in the [redacted] case. You noted, "Just what does he mean by this?"

You will recall that Senator McCarthy on July 25, 1950, made a statement on the floor of the Senate concerning "Mr. X" in the State Department, who was subsequently identified as [redacted] subject of a full field loyalty investigation by the Bureau. In making his statement, Senator McCarthy distributed copies of a document which purported to be a Civil Service Commission summary of the investigation of [redacted]. On July 25, 1950, the Attorney General asked us to conduct an investigation to determine the source from which Senator McCarthy obtained his document. The investigation disclosed that Senator McCarthy's document is apparently not an authentic copy of any document prepared by the CSC, the State Department or the Loyalty Review Board, according to representatives of these three Agencies. In addition, the document distributed by Senator McCarthy contains inaccuracies, and it was prepared in such a way as to indicate it could not have been prepared as a CSC summary of the investigation of [redacted]. In addition, you will recall that on March 23, 1950, the Baltimore Office advised us that [redacted] had advised an Agent of that office that Senator McCarthy was going to expose [redacted] a State Department employee. At that time, [redacted]

NOT RECORDED

119 NOV 13 1952

ORIGINAL FILED IN 121-23278-267x2

[redacted] had in his possession a memorandum, apparently from Senator McCarthy's office, which included quoted material, apparently from Bureau investigative reports. The possibility exists that the document which Senator McCarthy used on July 25, 1950, is the same document which [redacted] had in his possession on March 20, 1950, and the possibility further exists that this is the document that [redacted] was referring to on September 15, 1950, as noted above. It would further appear from the above that [redacted] was not thinking when he said what he did on September 15, 1950.

At the suggestion of the Attorney General, I interviewed Senator McCarthy on August 4, 1950, as to the source of the document which accompanied his press release regarding [redacted] Senator McCarthy refused to disclose his source, and he further said he had instructed the employees in his office not to disclose the source of any of his material, since he felt it his duty to protect his sources. (121-23276-223) b2 c

In view of the above, it is respectfully suggested that we do not interview [redacted] concerning his statement given to us on September 15, 1950.

For your information, the investigation requested by the Attorney General concerning Senator McCarthy's document, which is captioned, "Unknown Subject; Source of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's Information Re. Government Employees' Removal of Government Property; Loyalty of Government Employees" is continuing.

With reference to your inquiry concerning the correctness of the date on which [redacted] called the Bureau you are advised that the correct date is October 2, 1950, and not August 2, 1950, which date appeared in the memorandum from Mr. Belmont to me dated October 4, 1950. We regret that this inaccuracy occurred and we have corrected it.

WASHINGTON FROM WASH. FIELD

DIRECTOR

DEFERRED

UNSUB PAREN SOURCE OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. MC CARTHY'S INFORMATION REGARDING

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES REPAIR. REF. LGE. RESULAT OCTOBER FIVE NINETEEN

FIFTY REQUESTING INTERVIEW OF [REDACTED] CSC INVESTIGATOR, AT INSTRUCT

OF DAG PITION FORD. [REDACTED] ON INTERVIEW UNAWARE OF ANY REASON SUGGESTING

HIS POSSESSION OF INFORMATION REGARDING INSTANT INVESTIGATION. QUESTIONING

DEVELOPED HE HANDLED CSC INVESTIGATION OF [REDACTED] SEVERAL YEARS AGO.

SUBSEQUENTLY HIS SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN [REDACTED] CASE WERE QUOTED

IN EITHER PM OR DAILY WORKER. INFORMATION APPARENTLY HAVING BEEN ILLEGITIMATELY

OBTAINED FROM CSC FILES. [REDACTED] OTHERWISE KNOWN AS QUOTE ROBERT E. WIGGOTT.

THIS APPELLATION MAY HAVE BEEN CONFUSED WITH QUOTE MR. X WIGGOTT, BY

WHICH [REDACTED] REFERRED TO, THUS RESULTING IN CONFUSED BELIEF THAT [REDACTED]

HAS INFORMATION IN INSTANT CASE. SUGGEST DAG FORD BE SO INFORMED

SO AS TO DETERMINE IF ANY OTHER REASON TO INDICATE [REDACTED] SHOULD HAVE ANY

INFORMATION IN INSTANT CASE. UNLESS FURTHER ADVISED, [REDACTED] INTERVIEW

WILL NOT BE INCLUDED IN REPORT. INVESTIGATION PROCEEDING.

ROUTED

RECORDED - 4

FEB 19 1951

INDEXED - 4

EX 12

127-21939

59 FEB 26 1951

16K

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. A. H. Belmont

DATE: October 10, 1950

FROM : C. H. Stanley *CHS*

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT

(Source of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's
Information Regarding Government Employees)
 Removal of Government Property
 LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Tolson _____
 Ladd _____
 Clegg _____
 Glavin _____
 Nichols _____
 Rosen _____
 Tracy _____
 Harbo _____
 Mohr _____
 Tele. Room _____
 Nease _____
 Gandy _____

PURPOSE:

To advise Mr. Peyton Ford results of interview with [REDACTED]
 Civil Service Commission Investigator.

BACKGROUND:

By memorandum dated September 28, 1950, Mr. Peyton Ford, Deputy Attorney General, requested the Bureau to interview [REDACTED] a Civil Service Commission Investigator, who may have some helpful information regarding the matter under investigation.

[REDACTED] was interviewed by Agents of the Washington Field Office on October 6, and advised that he was unaware of any reason suggesting his possession of information regarding instant case. Upon questioning it was developed that he handled Civil Service Commission Investigation of [REDACTED] several years ago and subsequently his summary and recommendations in [REDACTED] case were quoted in either the "Daily Worker" or the magazine "PM," such information apparently having been illegally obtained from the Civil Service Commission files. According to [REDACTED] was also known as "Dr. X," which may have been the reason for the belief that he knew something about instant case since [REDACTED] has been referred to in this case as "Dr. X."

RECOMMENDATION:

If you agree, there is attached hereto a suggested memorandum to Mr. Peyton Ford advising him that [REDACTED] was interviewed at which time he stated that he was unaware of any reason suggesting that he was in possession of information regarding instant investigation.

121-23378

RECORDED - 47

INDEXED - 47

EX-127

FEB 13 1951

59 FEB 26 1951

121-41668-1055

267-11

b7c

RECEIVED
1044722 YTTJCS

DEC 11 1950

10-10-50
181
CONTINUED TO PAGE 2

FBI WASH FIELD

DIRECTOR

UNSUB PAKEN SOURCE OF SENATOR ROBERT F. EMMETT'S INFORMATION
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WHO PAKEN REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
RICHARDSON, CHAIRMAN, LOYALTY REVIEW BOARD, ADVISED ON INTERVIEW THIS MORNING
THAT ABOUT THE TIME OF THE MC CARTHY STATEMENT IN INSTANT MATTER BROKE.
RICHARDSON RECEIVED A PHONE CALL FROM DREW PEARSON, WITH WHOM HE IS FRIENDLY
AND PEARSON SAID IN EFFECT - I HAVE BEEN TOLD BY A MEMBER OF SENATOR MC CARTHY
STAFF THAT HE HAS BEEN OBTAINING INFORMATION FROM AN INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYED IN LRB
ALSO AN INDIVIDUAL EMPLOYED IN LRB HAS BEEN SEEN AT SENATOR MC CARTHY'S OFFICE
AND WHAT ABOUT THIS FELLOW [REDACTED] WHO WORKS FOR YOU. IN OTHER WORDS, RICHARDSON
CANNOT SAY THAT PEARSON SAID [REDACTED] HAD BEEN FURNISHING INFORMATION TO MC CARTHY
OR HAD BEEN SEEN AT MC CARTHY'S OFFICE, BUT THE IMPLICATION WAS OBVIOUS. AT THE
TIME OF PEARSON'S CALL RICHARDSON WAS NOT AWARE OF [REDACTED] IDENTITY AS AN EMPLOYEE
OF LRB, AND SO INFORMED PEARSON. THEN PEARSON INQUIRED AS TO WHERE HE MIGHT
SECURE A LIST OF NAMES OF THE EMPLOYEES OF LRB, AND RICHARDSON HAD L. J. WALSH,
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF LRB PREPARE SUCH A LIST, AND BRING IT TO RICHARDSON'S
HOUSE WHERE A LEG-MAN OF PEARSON'S CAME AND RECEIVED IT. RICHARDSON IS WILLING
TO HAVE THESE FACTS RECITED TO PEARSON. IF THE BUREAU WISHES TO CONTACT PEARSON
TO OBTAIN ANY FACTS IN PEARSON'S POSSESSION REGARDING THE SOURCE OF HIS INFORMATION,
INFORMATION, OR INVESTIGATIONS WITH REGARD TO [REDACTED] WHO IS PRINCIPAL
SUSPECT IN THIS CASE. RECORDED - 1044722 YTTJCS
RICHARDSON WOULD HAVE NO OBJECTION TO PEARSON'S REVEALING THE INFO TO THE BUREAU.
REQUEST ADVICE AS TO WHETHER BUREAU DESIRES TO CONTACT PEARSON.

121-11035 (1951)
Mr. Belmont
HOTTEL

67K

67K

Mr. Peyton Ford
Deputy Attorney General

October 10, 1950

Director, FBI

UNKNOWN SUBJECT

Source of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's
Information Regarding Government Employees)
Removal of Government Property
LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
Your reference JRM:GMD:W 51-36-91

Reference is made to your memorandum of September 28, 1950,
requesting that the Bureau interview [redacted] a Civil Service
Commission Investigator, who may have some helpful information regarding
instant case.

Please be advised that on October 6, 1950, [redacted] was
interviewed by Agents of the Washington Field Office of this Bureau,
at which time [redacted] advised that he was unaware of any reason suggest-
ing he was in possession of information regarding instant investigation.

The above is being called to your attention in the event
you have further information which may assist this Bureau in inter-
viewing [redacted]

APPROPRIATE AGENCIES
AND FIELD OFFICES
ADVISED BY ROUTING
SLIP (S) OF *declassification*
DATE *5-10-78*

DATE *5-10-78*

121-23278

DECLASSIFIED BY *3132*
ON *5-10-78*

LJS/bja

6-8-51
6-8-51
6-8-51

121 10 4 58 64 12

112 DEPT CL 10 11 12
6-8-51

RECORDED - 47

MAILED
OCT 11 1950
COMM - FBI

EX-127

OCT 13 1950

Tolson _____
Ladd _____
Clegg _____
Glavin _____
Nichols _____
Rosen _____
Tracy _____
Harbo _____
Belmont _____
Mohr _____
Tele. room _____
Nease _____
Gandy _____

66 FEB 26 1951

SAC, Washington Field

October 11, 1950

Director, FBI

BY SPECIAL MESSENGER

UNKNOWN SUBJECT

(Source of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's
Information Regarding Government Employees)
Removal of Government Property
LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Reurlet September 19, 1950, and Bulet September 29, 1950. You are instructed to set forth in your report reflecting additional investigation in instant case information obtained from [redacted] during his interview with Special Agent [redacted] of your office. This information was previously submitted by your letter of September 19, 1950. Expedite submission of report.

b7c

[redacted] b7c

AB
g

RECEIVED READING ROOM
FBI
OCT 12 10 25 AM '50

RECORDED - 47

121-4166
1-21-23
FEB 18 1951

OCT 15 5 32 PM '50

MAILED 10
OCT 12 1950
COMM - FBI

267 x 9
b7c

Mr. Tolson
Mr. Ladd
Mr. Clegg
Mr. Glavin
Mr. Nichols
Mr. Rosen
Mr. Tracy
Mr. Harbo
Mr. Belmont
Mr. Mohr
Tele. Room
Mr. Nease
Miss Gandy

OCT 18 1951

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. D. M. Ladd *DM*

DATE: October 11, 1950

FROM : A. H. Belmont *AB*

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT

Source of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's
Information Regarding Government Employees)
 Removal of Government Property
 LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

☐ Mr. Tolson
☐ Mr. E. A. Tamm
☐ Mr. Clegg
☐ Mr. Glavin
☐ Mr. Ladd
☐ Mr. Nichols
☐ Mr. Rosen
☐ Mr. Tracy
☐ Mr. Carson
☐ Mr. Egan
☐ Mr. Gurnea
☐ Mr. Harbo
☐ Mr. Hendon
☐ Mr. Pennington
☐ Mr. Quinn Tamm
☐ Mr. Nease
☐ Miss Gandy

PURPOSE:

To include in WFO report information pertaining to [redacted] admission to Bureau agent that he had prepared CSC Summary of Information which was used by Senator McCarthy on the floor of the Senate in the case referred to by Senator McCarthy as Mr. X. McCarthy later distributed copies of the alleged CSC Summary.

BACKGROUND:

You will recall by letter dated September 19, 1950, the Washington Field Office advised that [redacted] now employed as an investigator by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, stated to Special Agent [redacted] of the WFO that he would like to get a copy of the Bureau's summary report on Lattimore. Surine presumed that approximately twelve Bureau offices had made reports and that copies had been distributed to ONI and G-2; further, that in the past he had been able to secure some information from the New York Office of ONI. Surine claimed he needed such a report inasmuch as Senator McCarthy in the future would not make any further allegations without being able to support such allegations by an investigative report. He said that if he could get the report, he could attribute the information contained therein to another government investigative agency explaining that, "This is what happened in the [redacted] case." You will recall that the case presented before the Senate by Senator McCarthy and described as the case of Mr. X was later determined to be the case of [redacted]

Surine further advised that he was aware that the Bureau had initiated an investigation to determine how Senator McCarthy could have obtained the information appearing in the CSC investigative file concerning [redacted] and that he also had heard that the Senator had been questioned in this regard by you. [redacted] indicated that if he could have the Lattimore summary report it would be handled in the same fashion as was done in the [redacted] case, explaining that he would insert the information appearing in the Bureau report in the form of a summary of information appearing in the CSC investigative files; thus making it appear that his office had secured a CSC file rather than a Bureau file. In this way, [redacted] said he would not be violating any laws inasmuch as the CSC summary report would not be a bona fide report of a government agency and thus, a Theft of Government Property case, as such, could not be proved.

Attachment

6 FEB 27 1951

RECORDED - 47
 INDEXED - 47
 EX-127

FEB 13 1951

8

FILED
 100

b7c

Agent [redacted] advised that [redacted] did not specifically ask him to secure a copy of this report nor did he in any way intimate that he could obtain this report from his Bureau acquaintances. He likewise did not indicate that Senator McCarthy was aware of the practice evidently adopted by him in the [redacted] base or in making such an informal request for a Bureau report. Agent [redacted] further advised that the foregoing data was volunteered in its entirety by [redacted] who made the statements without any solicitation on the part of [redacted]

You will also recall that by memorandum dated September 19, 1950, Deputy Attorney General Peyton Ford instructed the Bureau to reopen its investigation in this matter and to interview certain individuals who had been previously set forth in Bureau memorandum to the Department as not having been interviewed due to their absence from the city or illness. The investigation is still continuing at this time and a report has not been submitted by the Washington Field Office reflecting the additional investigation conducted by that office as requested by Mr. Peyton Ford.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the WFO be instructed to include in its report in instant case information obtained by Special Agent [redacted] from [redacted] indicating the method used by [redacted] in his handling of the case referred to by Senator McCarthy as Mr. X and later identified by the Bureau as the case of [redacted]. If you agree, a suggested teletype to WFO is attached.

✓ dl
JF

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Mr. D. M. Ladd

FROM : A. E. Belmont

SUBJECT: UNKNOWN SUBJECT
SOURCE OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S
INFORMATION REGARDING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY
LOYALTY OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

DATE: October 12, 1950

PURPOSE:

To have Mr. Drew Pearson, well known newspaper columnist, interviewed by Assistant Director Nichols concerning instant case. Mr. Seth W. Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board, has indicated that Pearson may have some information concerning this matter.

BACKGROUND:

You will recall that Senator McCarthy on July 25, 1950, made a statement on the floor of the Senate concerning a "Mr. X" in the State Department, who was subsequently identified as [REDACTED] subject of a full field loyalty investigation by the Bureau.

In making his statement Senator McCarthy distributed copies of a document which purported to be a Civil Service Commission summary of the investigation of Poseniak. On July 25, 1950, the Attorney General asked us to conduct an investigation to determine the source from which Senator McCarthy obtained the above summary, indicating in his request that there may have been a violation of Title 18, Sections 541 and 2071, USCA, dealing with the theft, embezzlement and unlawful removal of government documents. The Attorney General suggested that all interviews and other inquiries believed to be logical and necessary should be conducted.

The investigation conducted by the Bureau in this matter disclosed that the summary distributed by Senator McCarthy is apparently not an authentic copy of any document prepared by the Civil Service Commission, the State Department or the Loyalty Review Board; further, that no documents similar to the summary distributed by McCarthy could be located in the files of these three agencies. The summary bears what purports to be a date stamp of the Investigations Division, Civil Service Commission; however, no date stamps of the Civil Service Commission were found during the investigation similar to the one appearing on the summary. It was also noted that the summary on page two characterizes the United American Spanish Aid Committee as having been cited by the Attorney General. It will be noted that the summary is dated September 10, 1948, whereas the United American Spanish Aid Committee was not cited by the Attorney General until April 21, 1949.

Information was received on a highly confidential basis from [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] Loyalty Review Board, was a possible suspect in this case. [REDACTED] stated that the Civil Service Commission in 1944 established for all practical purposes that [REDACTED] had been furnishing information to Congressmen Wigglesworth, Busbey,

Attachment

RECORDED - 41

INDEXED - 41

FEB 13 1951

EX-127-8

267/41

b7c-D

Reese, and Bursell. According to [redacted] spends a great deal of time extracting information from FBI reports, reports from the HCUA and other sources which he places on three by five cards. According to [redacted] is fanatical on the subject of Communism and feels that the government is not taking appropriate steps to remove Communists from the government. At the time of the interview it was determined that [redacted] was then [redacted]

Bureau files disclose that [redacted] was a subject of a Special Inquiry type investigation for the position of [redacted]

b7
C
b6

[redacted] August 14, 1950, copies of the investigation reports reflecting the results of the investigation conducted in this matter were transmitted to the Attorney General, at which time it was pointed out that Mr. Seth W. Richardson and Mr. L. V. Meloy, both of the Loyalty Review Board, and Mr. James E. Hatcher, Civil Service Commission, were not interviewed because it was ascertained that Richardson and Hatcher were somewhere in the North on vacation and that Meloy was suffering from a heart attack. In addition to the reports reflecting the results of the investigation conducted in instant case, the Attorney General was also furnished with copies of the Special Inquiry type investigation conducted by the Bureau concerning [redacted]

By letter dated September 19, 1950, the Washington Field Office advised that [redacted] now employed as an investigator by Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, stated to Special Agent [redacted] of the Washington Field Office that he would like to get a copy of the Bureau's summary report on Lattimore. [redacted] presumed that approximately twelve Bureau offices had submitted reports and that copies had been distributed to ONI and G-2; further, that in the past he had been able to secure some information from the New York Office of ONI. Surine claimed he needed such a report inasmuch as Senator McCarthy in the future would not make any further allegations without being able to support such allegations by an investigative report. He said that if he could get the report he could attribute the information contained therein to another government investigative agency explaining that "this is what happened in the [redacted] case." You will recall that the case presented before the Senate by Senator McCarthy and described as the case of "Mr. X" was later determined to be the case of [redacted]

[redacted] further advised that he was aware that the Bureau had initiated an investigation to determine how Senator McCarthy could have obtained the information appearing in the Civil Service Commission investigative file concerning [redacted]

b7c

[redacted] and that he also had heard that the Senator had been questioned in this regard by you. [redacted] indicated that if he could have the Lattimore summary report it would be handled in the same fashion as was done in the [redacted] case, explaining that he would insert the information appearing in the Bureau report in the form of a summary of information appearing in the Civil Service Commission investigative files, thus making it appear that his office had secured a Civil Service Commission file rather than a Bureau file. In this way [redacted] said he would not be violating any laws inasmuch as the CSC summary report would not be a bona fide report of a government agency and thus a theft of government property case, as such, could not be proved.

You will also recall that by memorandum dated September 19, 1950, Deputy Attorney General Peyton Ford instructed the Bureau to reopen its investigation in this matter and to interview certain individuals who had been previously set forth in Bureau memorandum to the Attorney General of August 16, 1950, as not having been interviewed due to their absence from the city or illness.

On October 10, 1950, Mr. Seth W. Richardson, Chairman, Loyalty Review Board, was interviewed by a Washington Field Office Agent, at which time he advised that about the time of the McCarthy statement in instant case broke, Richardson received a phone call from Drew Pearson, with whom he is friendly, and Pearson at that time said in effect, "I have been told by a member of Senator McCarthy's staff that he has been obtaining information from an individual employed in the Loyalty Review Board...further, that an individual employed by the Loyalty Review Board has been seen at Senator McCarthy's office...What about this fellow [redacted] who works for you?"

Richardson advised that he cannot say that Pearson said [redacted] had been furnishing information to McCarthy or had been seen at McCarthy's office, but the implication was obvious. At the time of Pearson's call Richardson was not aware of [redacted] identity as an employee of the Loyalty Review Board and so informed Pearson. Pearson then inquired of Richardson as to whether he might secure a list of names of the employees of the Loyalty Review Board and Richardson had L. V. Meloy, Executive Secretary of the Loyalty Review Board, prepare such a list which was turned over to Pearson. Mr. Richardson advised that he is willing to have these facts recited to Pearson if the Bureau wishes to contact Pearson to obtain any facts in his possession regarding the source of McCarthy's information, or in particular with regard to [redacted] Richardson further indicated that he would have no objection to Pearson's revealing the information to the Bureau.

In Deputy Attorney General Ford's memorandum of September 19, 1950, as was pointed out previously, he instructed the Bureau to interview Seth W. Richardson and other persons mentioned in Bureau memorandum of August 16, 1950, including [redacted] at times deemed propitious and develop all logical leads.

RECOMMENDATION:

If you agree, it is recommended that the attached memorandum be routed to Assistant Director Nichols for the purpose of having Drew Pearson interviewed concerning information in his possession concerning instant case. This recommendation is being made since Mr. Peyton Ford has instructed the Bureau to cover all logical leads and specifically to interview Seth W. Richardson, who in turn has furnished us information indicating that Pearson has additional information concerning this matter. For the assistance of Assistant Director Nichols there is attached hereto a summary memorandum in instant case dated August 16, 1950, setting forth background information and the results of the investigation conducted as of that time.

I think we should
specifically ask Ford
whether it is desired
that Pearson be
interviewed; if he
does, we should tell
Pearson our contact
with him is pursuant
to Ford's request.

10-12

Memo Ford

10-16-50

b7C